



**University of  
Zurich**<sup>UZH</sup>

**Zurich Open Repository and  
Archive**

University of Zurich  
University Library  
Strickhofstrasse 39  
CH-8057 Zurich  
[www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)

---

Year: 1984

---

**Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and  
Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts**

Pisano, Stephen

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-151878>

Monograph

Published Version

Originally published at:

Pisano, Stephen (1984). Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts. Freiburg, Switzerland / Göttingen, Germany: Universitätsverlag / Vandenhoeck Ruprecht.

PISANO · ADDITIONS OR OMISSIONS IN THE BOOKS OF  
SAMUEL

## ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

Published by the Biblical Institute of the University  
of Fribourg Switzerland  
the Seminar für Biblische Zeitgeschichte  
of the University of Münster i. W. Federal Republic of Germany  
and the Schweizerische Gesellschaft  
für orientalische Altertumswissenschaft  
Editor: Othmar Keel  
Coeditors: Erich Zenger and Albert de Pury

### *The Author:*

Stephen Pisano, S. J., received his Bachelor of Arts degree from Gonzaga University, Spokane (U.S.A.), in 1968. He studied theology at the Faculté de Théologie de Lyon-Fourvière from 1972 until 1974 and then at the Theology Faculty of Centre Sèvres, Paris, from 1974 to 1976. He was awarded the *Maîtrise en Théologie* (S.T.L.) in 1976. From 1976 until 1978 he studied at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, from which he received the *Licentiate in Sacred Scripture* (S.S.L.). After further research at the Biblical Institute during 1979–1980 he began doctoral studies at the University of Fribourg in 1980 and defended his thesis before the Theology Faculty of that university in 1982. Since 1982 he has been teaching textual criticism and Old Testament exegesis at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome.

STEPHEN PISANO, S.J.

ADDITIONS OR OMISSIONS  
IN THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL

The Significant Pluses and Minuses in  
the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts

UNIVERSITÄTSVERLAG FREIBURG SCHWEIZ  
VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT GÖTTINGEN  
1984



*CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek*

*Pisano, Stephen*

Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: the significant pluses and minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran texts / Stephen Pisano.

Freiburg (Schweiz): Universitätsverlag

Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1984.

(Orbis biblicus et orientalis; 57)

ISBN 3-7278-0315-0 (Universitätsverlag)

ISBN 3-525-53679-8 (Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht)

NE: GT

Publication subsidized by the Fribourg University Council  
Fribourg Switzerland

© 1984 by Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz  
Paulusdruckerei Freiburg Schweiz

Digitalisat erstellt durch Florian Lippke, Departement  
für Biblische Studien, Universität Freiburg Schweiz

To my Parents



## T A B L E   O F   C O N T E N T S

Table of Contents	vii
Foreword	xi
Abbreviations	xii
INTRODUCTION	1
PART 1 "NON-HAPLOGENIC" PLUSES	17
1.1 <u>"Non-haplogenic" pluses in LXX</u>	17
1 Sam 1:5 f.....	17
1:11.....	19
1:28 and 2:11a.....	24
3:20-4:1a.....	29
8:18.....	34
12:23.....	36
14:23b-24.....	37
19:22.....	41
30:16b-17a.....	42
2 Sam 8:7.....	43
8:8.....	47
11:22.....	49
14:27.....	55
19:11b.12b.....	57
24:15.....	61
24:25a.....	65
Conclusions.....	66
1.2 <u>"Non-haplogenic" pluses in MT</u>	70
1 Sam 2:22.....	70
4:21f.....	75
17-18.....	78
23:23.....	86
30:7.....	88
Conclusions.....	89

1.3	<u>Pluses and minuses of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in relation to MT</u>	91
	1 Sam 10:27-11:1.....	91
	2 Sam 5:4 f.....	98
	6:2.....	101
	6:7.....	104
	10:6 f.....	107
	24:16b-17a.....	112
	24:20.....	114
	Conclusions.....	116
1.4	<u>Double translations in LXX</u>	119
	1 Sam 2:24.....	119
	4:14-16.....	121
	15:3.....	125
	2 Sam 2:22b.....	127
	13:15-16a.....	128
	15:17 f.....	130
	15:19b-20.....	136
	15:34.....	137
	18:18.....	141
	19:19a.....	144
	20:18-19a.....	146
	20:22a.....	149
	21:15b-16a.....	151
	Conclusions.....	154
PART 2	"HAPLOGENIC" PLUSES	157
2.1	<u>"Haplogenic" pluses in LXX</u>	157
	1 Sam 1:24 f.....	157
	3:15.....	164
	10:1.....	166
	10:21.....	169
	12:8.....	172
	13:5.....	175
	13:15.....	175
	14:41.....	183
	14:42.....	199

15:12.f.....	204
23:6.....	207
29:10.....	208
30:24.....	217
2 Sam 13:21.....	219
13:27.....	224
13:34b.....	225
14:30.....	232
15:20b.....	236
Conclusions.....	238
2.2 "Haplogenic" pluses in MT.....	243
1 Sam 2:31 f.....	243
4:9.....	248
6:4.....	249
19:15.....	257
20:34.....	259
23:11 f.....	260
25:13a.....	267
26:5.....	270
2 Sam 6:3 f.....	272
7:25-27a.....	277
Conclusions.....	281
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	283
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	287



## F O R E W O R D

This study represents a doctoral dissertation which was defended at the University of Fribourg in November 1982.

I thank most especially Prof. Dominique Barthélemy, O.P., for his knowledgeable and ever-helpful direction as well as for his generosity in making his time and resources available to me. His example was and will remain a constant source of inspiration.

A special word of thanks and indebtedness to His Eminence, Cardinal Carlo Maria Martini, Archbishop of Milan, who first introduced me to the study of textual criticism at the Biblical Institute and who has honored me with his interest during my studies.

I am grateful to the rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Fr. Maurice Gilbert, and to its entire community for their support and encouragement, as well as to the Marianist community of Regina Mundi for their kind hospitality during my stay in Fribourg.

This work would not have been possible without the patient and generous help of Sr. Yvonne Dumont, who typed the manuscript and whom I thank de tout coeur.

My thanks to Prof. Othmar Keel for accepting the book for Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. I am especially grateful to this series and to the Pontifical Biblical Institute for defraying the cost of publication. My thanks also to all those who have encouraged and supported me along the way.

Rome, May 25th 1984

Stephen Pisano, S.J.



# ABBREVIATIONS

Ant	The Antiochian text of the Greek Old Testament, as found ordinarily in the mss b o c <sub>2</sub> e <sub>2</sub> for the books of Samuel.
Ant.	Josephus, <u>Jewish Antiquities</u> .
BASOR	<u>Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research</u> .
BDB	Brown, Driver, Briggs, <u>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</u> .
BHS	<u>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</u> .
BJ	<u>La Bible de Jérusalem</u> . (The abbreviation BJ is used when both the first and the third editions are in agreement.)
BJ <sup>1</sup>	<u>La Sainte Bible...de Jérusalem</u> . 1st ed., 1948-1953.
BJ <sup>3</sup>	<u>La Bible de Jérusalem</u> . Nouvelle édition, 1973.
Böttcher	F. Böttcher, <u>Neue Exegetisch-kritische Aehrenlese</u> , 1863.
Budde, KHAT	K. Budde, <u>Die Bücher Samuel</u> . Kurz Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, 1902.
Budde, SBOT	K. Budde, <u>The Books of Samuel</u> . The Sacred Books of the Old Testament, 1894.
CTAT	D. Barthélemy et al., <u>Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament.... Rapport final du comité pour l'analyse textuelle de l'A.T. hébreu</u> , 1982.
Dhorme	P. Dhorme, <u>Les Livres de Samuel</u> , 1910.
Dhorme (1956)	<u>La Bible</u> . Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, E. Dhorme, ed., 1956.
Driver	S. R. Driver, <u>Notes on...the Books of Samuel</u> , 2nd ed., 1913.
Ehrlich	A.B. Ehrlich, <u>Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel</u> . Band 3: Josua, Richter, I und II Samuel, 1910.

- Erdmann D. Erdmann, Die Bücher Samuelis, 1873.
- Eü Das Alte Testament. Einheitsübersetzung, 1974.
- Fernandez A. Fernandez, 1 Samuel 1-15 Critica Textual, 1917.
- GK W. Gesenius and E. Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 1910.
- Graetz H. Graetz, Emendationes in...Veteris Testamenti Libros, Fasc. 3, 1894.
- Hertzberg H. W. Hertzberg, I and II Samuel, 1964.
- HOTTP Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project, 1976.
- Houbigant C. F. Houbigant, Notae Criticae, 1777.
- HTR Harvard Theological Review.
- Hummelauer F. de Hummelauer, Commentarius in Libros Samuelis, 1886.
- JBL Journal of Biblical Literature.
- JSOT Journal for the Study of the Old Testament.
- JSS Journal of Semitic Studies.
- KB L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, 1953.
- Keil C. F. Keil, Die Bücher Samuels, 1864.
- Kittel R. Kittel, ed., Biblia Hebraica, 3rd ed., 1937.
- Klostermann A. Klostermann, Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige, 1887.
- Löhr M. Löhr, Die Bücher Samuels, 1898.
- LXX The majority text of the Septuagint without further specification.
- McCarter P.K. McCarter, I Samuel, 1980.
- NAB The New American Bible, 1969.
- NEB The New English Bible, 1972.
- Nowack W. Nowack, Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis, 1902.

- OG The oldest Greek text available of the Septuagint.
- OL The Old Latin text, cited from Sabatier, Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae, as OLs and from Vercellone, Variae Lectiones, as OLv.
- Osty La Bible, E. Osty, ed., 1973.
- Peters N. Peters, Beiträge zur Text- und Literarkritik...der Bücher Samuel, 1899.
- QTSJ E. C. Ulrich, The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus, 1978.
- RB Revue Biblique.
- RSV The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version, 1966.
- Schulz I A. Schulz, Die Bücher Samuel. Erster Halbband: Das Erste Buch Samuel, 1919.
- Schulz II A. Schulz, Die Bücher Samuel. Zweiter Halbband: Das Zweite Buch Samuel, 1920.
- Smith H. P. Smith, The Books of Samuel, 2nd ed., 1912.
- Stoebe H. J. Stoebe, Das Erste Buch Samuelis, 1973.
- Syr The Syriac Version of the Old Testament.
- Tg Targum Jonathan.
- Thenius<sup>1</sup> O. Thenius, Die Bücher Samuels, 1st ed., 1842.
- Thenius<sup>2</sup> O. Thenius, Die Bücher Samuels, 2nd ed., 1864.
- Vg The Vulgate translation of the Old Testament.
- VT Vetus Testamentum.
- Wellhausen J. Wellhausen, Der Text der Bücher Samuelis, 1871.
- ZAW Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
- Zorell F. Zorell, Lexicon Hebraicum Veteris Testamenti, 1940.

## I N T R O D U C T I O N

Whoever has compared the Septuagint text of the books of Samuel with that of the Hebrew Massoretic text has been struck immediately by the large number of pluses and minuses in each of these texts with respect to the other. What is perhaps even more striking than their sheer number, however, is the great length which many of these pluses attain, extending sometimes over the space of several verses (e.g., 1 Sam 17:12-32, absent entirely from a large number of LXX manuscripts), whole verses (e.g., 2 Sam 11:22, where LXX contains at least one verse absent from MT), or, which is more frequently the case, large segments occurring within or at the end of verses (e.g., the description of the Urim and Tummim at 1 Sam 14:41, absent from MT).

With the discovery at Qumran of fragments of three different Hebrew texts of Samuel, not only were many of the pluses and minuses of LXX found to agree with these scrolls extending from the third to the first centuries, B.C.,<sup>1</sup> but other pluses, found neither in MT nor in LXX, were discovered as well.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Cf. F. M. Cross, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," BASOR 132 (1953) 15-26; idem, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," JBL 74 (1955) 147-172; idem, The Ancient Library at Qumran, 2d. ed., (Garden City, 1961); Eugene C. Ulrich, "4Q Sam<sup>c</sup>: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Sam 14-15 from the Scribe of the Serek Hay-yahad (1QS)," BASOR 235 (1979) 1-25.

2 F. M. Cross, "The Ammonite Oppression of the Tribes of Gad and Reuben: Missing Verses from 1 Samuel 11 Found in 4QSamuel<sup>a</sup>," in The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel. 1980 Proceedings IOSCS - Vienna, ed. E. Tov, (Jerusalem, 1980) [HGTS], 105-119.

While it is generally recognized that the text of Samuel which was chosen to become the official Massoretic text was deficient in many ways, and that the LXX may be used to emend errors which have crept into the text of MT,<sup>3</sup> the extent to which these pluses or minuses are to be taken as original readings, and the extent to which a variant in their regard in MT or LXX (or 4QSam) witnesses to an accidental or deliberate insertion or omission, is far from agreed upon. This will become clear in the pages which follow as we examine each case individually. By way of introduction, however, it is necessary to see the general tendencies which authors have followed with regard to the emendation of the Hebrew text of Samuel.<sup>4</sup>

Although interest in the use of the LXX for text-critical purposes is found already in the critics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,<sup>5</sup> the first to use the LXX systematically to correct the Hebrew text was Otto Thenius in his commentary on the books of Samuel which appeared in 1842.<sup>6</sup> After comparing the Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus with MT, he concluded that the LXX "as it appears in the edition according to the Vatican manuscript, was executed according to an essentially better and especially fuller Hebrew manuscript than that which lies at the basis of MT, and that because of its nature it is to be considered as a Hebrew manuscript, and it is to be used as the chief means for criticism of the text."<sup>7</sup>

---

3 Cf. B. J. Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions, (Cardiff, 1955), p. 182.

4 For the complete references to the frequently cited commentaries occurring throughout this study, see List of Abbreviations.

5 E.g., Jean Morin, Exercitationes Biblicae de Hebraei Graecique Textus Sinceritate (Paris, 1633); Louis Cappel, Crítica Sacra (Paris, 1650); C. F. Houbigant, Biblia Hebraica cum Notis Criticis (Paris, 1753).

6 Die Bücher Samuel (Leipzig, 1842; 2d. ed., 1864).

7 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. xxix.

With the double affirmation that the Greek text of Codex Vaticanus was equivalent to a Hebrew manuscript and that it contained a text which was essentially superior to that of MT, Thenius laid the foundation for most subsequent use of the LXX in text-critical studies of Samuel. However, the wholesale and massive correction of the MT which Thenius undertook in 1842 could not benefit from the caveat enun-  
ciated in 1863 by Paul de Lagarde, who observed that before the LXX could be used for critical purposes, the original Old Greek translation had to be separated from recensional variants which had found their way into the manuscripts.<sup>8</sup>

In 1871, Julius Wellhausen, in his study of the text of Samuel,<sup>9</sup> refined Thenius' work, showing greater discrimination in his use of the Greek text and a more precise understanding of the inner-Greek variants on the basis of Lagarde's admonition. He agreed with Thenius, against Fraenkel,<sup>10</sup> that the Old Greek translation of Samuel went back to a recension of Samuel which was vastly different from MT, but warned that "if one is in a situation where a version must be used as a critical tool, then first of all the nature of its translation style must be sought."<sup>11</sup> This use of LXX, as pioneered by Thenius and refined by Wellhausen, was followed by the majority of text critics and commentators of Samuel who succeeded them.<sup>12</sup>

Two exceptions to this general tendency are found in Carl Friedrich Keil<sup>13</sup> and David Erdmann<sup>14</sup> who neither

---

8 Paul de Lagarde, Anmerkungen zur Griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbia (Leipzig, 1863), p. 2.

9 Der Text der Bücher Samuelis (Göttingen, 1871).

10 Z. Fraenkel, Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta (Leipzig, 1841).

11 Wellhausen, p. 9.

12 Cf. Böttcher (1863); Driver (<sup>1</sup>1890; <sup>2</sup>1913); Budde (SBOT; KHAT); Smith (<sup>1</sup>1898; <sup>2</sup>1912); Nowack (1902); Dhorme (1910).

13 Biblischer Commentar über die Prophetischen Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments. Zweiter Band: Die Bücher Samuels. (Leipzig, 1864).

14 Die Bücher Samuelis (Bielefeld und Leipzig, 1873).

refer to the LXX as a critical tool in the Introductions to their commentaries, nor accept Thenius' suggestions for emending the text of MT.

In a long review of Wellhausen's book on Samuel,<sup>15</sup> Th. Nöldeke, noting that Wellhausen's goal was the establishment of the original text, commented, "I certainly hope that no one will be induced to put his or any similar readings in an edition of the Hebrew text. I most certainly do not share the disdain for the 'fashion' of seeking in the editions the establishment of the text of a definite period, and am of the opinion that an edition of the Hebrew Old Testament should never go beyond the Massoretic text. After all, that is a text which at one time was actually in use.... The introduction of individually more or less certain corrections into a unified text of a later recension results in any case in a motley form, which as such never existed and which causes my philological sense to shudder."<sup>16</sup>

This same concern for the "philological sense" was shared by Max Löhr, who, ironically enough, was the editor of the third edition of Thenius' commentary.<sup>17</sup> In his Introduction he laid down the principle that "the goal of Old Testament text criticism is a philologically correct edition of MT, if we want to maintain common and sure ground under our feet."<sup>18</sup> He issued the admonition that when one goes beyond this in searching for the "original text", "the door is opened to even greater subjectivity than is the case in the situation [of the text itself], and it soon happens that each one sets up his own text."<sup>19</sup>

---

15 Th. Nöldeke, review of Der Text der Bücher Samuelis, by Julius Wellhausen, in Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie 16 (1873), pp. 117-122.

16 Nöldeke, p. 118.

17 Max Löhr, Die Bücher Samuels von Otto Thenius<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig, 1898).

18 Löhr, p. xc.

19 Löhr, p. xci.

H. P. Smith reacted strongly against this approach of Löhr's in his own commentary on Samuel,<sup>20</sup> pointing out that since the MT itself came from a probably single, defective manuscript and "swarms with errors", "it forms no natural stopping place in the history -- or at least it forms no stopping place of which the exegete can say 'this is the goal of my labours'." <sup>21</sup> Commenting on Löhr's canon that pluses in LXX should be accepted only where the context impels us to do so, <sup>22</sup> he maintains that "it cannot be shown that the translators of G made insertions in their text. All the evidence goes to show that they tried to render the text before them."<sup>23</sup>

The extent to which LXX's Vorlage may have differed from MT lies at the basis of A. Schulz' more cautious acceptance of LXX as a tool for emending the text.<sup>24</sup> While recognizing the frequently poor state of MT, he claims that it can not always be clearly ascertained, when a divergency exists between it and LXX, whether LXX has simply not translated literally or whether a different Hebrew text formed its Vorlage. He distinguishes between variants in LXX which seem to have come from a Hebrew text different from MT and those which seem to be Greek originals,<sup>25</sup> and concludes, more cautiously than Smith, that each case must be decided on its own merits.<sup>26</sup>

The usefulness of LXX for emending MT was further criticized by H.S. Nyberg who, in an article on the text-

---

20 A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel (Edinburgh, 1898; 2d. ed., 1912).

21 Smith<sup>2</sup>, p. 397.

22 Löhr, p. xci.

23 Smith<sup>2</sup> p. 400.

24 Die Bücher Samuel. Erster Halbband: Das Erste Buch Samuel (Münster in Westf., 1919); Zweiter Halbband: Das Zweite Buch Samuel (Münster in Westf., 1920).

25 Schulz II, pp. 319f.

26 Schulz II, p. 323.



critical problems of Hosea, in 1934,<sup>27</sup> and in a book on the same subject in 1935,<sup>28</sup> pointed out that the study of OT text tradition is not different from, and should not be separated from, ancient oriental text tradition study in general. He accused the OT critics of having proceeded too quickly to the emendation of the Hebrew text without having first taken sufficient time to understand the text, and proposed the recollection of "eine gute alte philologische Regel": "When one does not understand a passage, one should first mistrust oneself and not the text."<sup>29</sup>

The most trenchant position against the use of LXX for Hebrew text emendation is found in P.A.H. de Boer, who concluded in the chapter on the LXX in his Research into the Text of Samuel I-XVI<sup>30</sup> that "on the grounds of our research, this part of G can be considered of little value for the determination of the 'original' Hebrew text. The divergencies give important material for the determination of the intrinsic value of the translation and point out the difficulties which M has not smoothed out, but they cannot amend the Hebrew text."<sup>31</sup>

In what might be called diametrical opposition to this approach of de Boer's, F. M. Cross, on the basis of

---

27 "Das Textkritische Problem des Alten Testaments am Hoseabuch Demonstriert," ZAW 52(1934) 241-254. Although Nyberg's study was not of the books of Samuel, his position influenced later Samuel commentators. See below, H. J. Stoebe.

28 Studien zum Hoseabuch. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Klärung des Problems der alttestamentlichen Textkritik (Uppsala, 1935).

29 Nyberg, "Das textkritische Problem...", p. 247.

30 Research into the Text of 1 Samuel I-XVI (Amsterdam, 1938), continued in Oldtestamentische Studien I (1942) and VI(1949).

31 de Boer, Research, p. 69. This attitude is mirrored in the apparatus criticus of the text of Samuel in BHS (1976), which was prepared by de Boer.

the texts of Samuel discovered at Qumran, which are frequently in accord with LXX where the latter differs from MT, has emphasized the relative fluidity of Samuel traditions before the establishment of the Massoretic text and the need to take the divergent LXX and Qumran traditions seriously in attempting to arrive at a "more nearly original text" than that which MT provides.<sup>32</sup> Continuing a suggestion made by Albright in 1955,<sup>33</sup> Cross has accounted for the divergencies between MT, LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> by his "Theory of Local Texts", which identifies the Vorlage of the LXX as an Egyptian text, the text of Qumran as Palestinian, and that of proto-MT as Babylonian.<sup>34</sup> The high value which Cross places on the text of LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> for restoring MT to a "more nearly original" text is mirrored in the most recent commentary on Samuel to appear, that of P. Kyle McCarter.<sup>35</sup>

H. J. Stoebe, in his commentary on 1 Samuel,<sup>36</sup> is more reserved with regard to LXX and does not exclude the possibility that divergencies in LXX vis-à-vis MT may have come from the translator. He maintains, against Cross, that "the text type from G and from Qumran does not necessarily have to be better."<sup>37</sup> He claims further that it is not possible to establish a line of development according to which MT would be the latest and poorest of the texts, but rather it is necessary to remember that "each recension must be taken first of all for itself, and, insofar as possible, be understood through itself."<sup>38</sup> Stoebe refers approvingly

---

32 Cross, BASOR 132, pp. 24f.

33 W. F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible," BASOR 140 (1955) 27-33.

34 F. M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," HTR 57 (1964). p. 297.

35 I Samuel. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (Garden City, 1980).

36 Das Erste Buch Samuelis (Gütersloh, 1973).

37 Stoebe, p. 30.

38 Stoebe, p. 31.

to Nyberg's principles that "up to a relatively late period the border between oral and written tradition was not yet so sharply drawn as one frequently imagines, and also the fixed written form was still for a long time the basis for live narration."<sup>39</sup> As a result, the more ample text is not necessarily the more original, and the fuller LXX text which was present in Egypt could be the result of the fact that there the tradition no longer remained oral.<sup>40</sup> Thus he attributes many of the differences between MT and LXX to the different traditions, without seeking one original text whose variations from MT would necessarily signify corruptions in it.

In a recent conference on the text of Samuel, D. Barthélemy<sup>41</sup> has suggested that, while both MT and LXX contain evidence of textual corruption, LXX shows a higher degree of literary initiative, either on the part of its translators or already in its Vorlage, than MT especially in passages which LXX seems not to have understood or felt in need of clarification, whereas the text of MT has frequently preserved more difficult, but more original, readings.<sup>42</sup> The degree, therefore, to which LXX may be used to emend a supposed corruption in MT is reduced and, before such an emendation is introduced, the literary particularities of LXX or of its Vorlage must be taken into consideration. This same concern for the literary qualities of LXX, and their subsequent non-use for the correction of MT, is seen as well in the Final Report of the Committee of the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project as well.<sup>43</sup>

39 Stoebe, p. 32. Cf. Nyberg, "Das textkritische Problem...", p. 243.

40 Stoebe, p. 32.

41 "La Qualité du Texte Massorétique de Samuel," in HGTS, pp. 1-44.

42 Cf. Barthélemy, "La Qualité...", p. 44.

43 D. Barthélemy et al., Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. 1. Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther. (Fribourg/Göttingen, 1982).

To my knowledge, the only study devoted exclusively and specifically to the question of the pluses and minuses in the MT and LXX texts of Samuel is that of Norbert Peters.<sup>44</sup> Having examined 71 pluses in MT and 123 pluses in LXX "which form an independent sentence or are at least relatively lengthy,"<sup>45</sup> he concluded that: 1) the tendency to expand is greater in MT (54 cases) than in LXX (31 cases); 2) there is no tendency to shorten texts in Greek while MT has eight instances (1 Sam 1:8.11.18; 10:21; 2 Sam 11:22a.22b; 14:33; 19:43a); 3) in both MT and LXX there are absences due to scribal error, but the state of MT is much poorer than that of LXX (43 cases of omission in MT versus 16 in LXX); and finally, 4) the Greek text contains by far the better recension of the books of Samuel.<sup>46</sup>

Peters has rendered a real service in having gathered in one place this large number of variants, but his results are open to a certain amount of criticism. First of all, although the stated object of his study was those pluses "which form an independent sentence or are at least relatively lengthy", of the 71 pluses for MT, 29 are only three words or less, and of the 123 for LXX, 38 are three words or less. A judgment on such small units is much more difficult than for the lengthier pluses as, on the one hand, a smaller unit is more likely to have fallen out accidentally, although, on the other hand, such small units are highly characteristic of midrashic-type additions.<sup>47</sup>

---

44 Beiträge zur Text- und Literarkritik sowie zur Erklärung der Bücher Samuel (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1899).

45 Peters, p. 101.

46 Peters, pp. 158-163.

47 Cf. J. Weingreen, "Rabbinic-type Glosses in the Old Testament" JSS 2(1957), p. 150, where he cites brevity as one of the characteristics of such glosses. On the presence of glosses of this type in MT, cf. R. H. Pfeiffer, "Midrash in the Books of Samuel," Quantulacumque. Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake, ed. R. P. Casey, (London, 1937), pp. 303-316. On the possibility that such glosses might be found in LXX, cf. E. Tov, "Midrash-type Exegesis in the LXX of Joshua," RB 85(1978) 50-61.

Secondly, Peters has subjected most of his cases only to a very cursory examination which, especially in the case of those phrases which he considers textual accidents, do not take sufficient note of the context in which they are found.

Thirdly, although he mentions the difficulty of distinguishing between LXX variants which were found already in its Vorlage and those which are due to the Greek translations itself, his list of results makes no attempt to distinguish between these. He claims that the LXX plus at 2 Sam 24:25 is, in his opinion, attributable to the Greek translator,<sup>48</sup> yet goes on to say on the next page that, for seventeen cases in LXX where an addition was inserted "out of the context", "the whole translation technique does not permit the hypothesis of an insertion by the translator."<sup>49</sup>

Finally, and most damaging for his overall conclusions, his presumption is in favor of the Greek text since it is the older of the two. He admits this bias himself when he asserts that "the first question must continually be: How could MT arise from Gr?",<sup>50</sup> and this although he takes Löhr to task for having the same bias toward MT.<sup>51</sup>

The work of Peters, therefore, must be re-done, especially with emphasis given to a more thorough analysis of the cases treated, which is what will be attempted in this study.

The foregoing brief history of the fortunes of LXX as a critical tool for the correction of the Hebrew text of Samuel serves as an introduction to and justification of yet another examination of many of the same pluses and minuses which have been discussed since the onset of modern criticism. This study has as its point of departure, however, an observation resulting from a survey of the various commentators'

---

<sup>48</sup> Peters, p. 159.

<sup>49</sup> Peters, p. 160.

<sup>50</sup> Peters, p. 165.

<sup>51</sup> Peters, p. 165.

positions with regard to those pluses and minuses whose absence from MT (or from LXX) is ordinarily attributed to an accidental omission caused by homeoteleuton. The frequency of such cases in Samuel has been noted by virtually all commentators, and the usefulness of LXX for their restoration is commonly accepted. There are, however, a certain number of cases of apparent homeoteleuton, for which some authors have nonetheless opted for the originality of the shorter (and in most cases MT) text. One of the most striking examples is 1 Sam 14:42, where, although the LXX text suggests that its plus has accidentally fallen out of MT through an accident due to homeoteleuton which would have extended over the last five words of the verse, Wellhausen chose to accept the shorter MT as the original text, and called the homeoteleuton-like plus in LXX an insertion in the text.<sup>52</sup> Although many authors appear to accept the unwritten rule that, if the form of a plus indicates that it can be attributed to an error through homeoteleuton, then it must be, the example noted above suggests the rather disquieting possibility that even in those cases in which an apparent homeoteleuton occurs, the plus may still be the indication of a later editorial insertion into an originally shorter text. The possibility of this phenomenon, as a literary technique, was pointed out for the Hebrew text by Harold M. Wiener who wrote in 1929 that

An important formal trace of compilation which meets us in many of the O.T. narratives gives useful help in the work of disentangling the early material. It may be called the practice of resumptive repetition. Where an editor desired to incorporate something, he frequently inserted it, and then resumed the original narrative, repeating the last phrase before the break with more or less accuracy.<sup>53</sup>

---

52 Wellhausen, p. 95, followed by Driver, Nowack, Ehrlich, Kittel, Fernandez, Schulz, Hertzberg, Stoebe, RSV, NEB, NAB, BJ, Osty, TOB, Eü.

53 Harold M. Wiener, The Composition of Judges II, 11 to I Kings II, 46, (Leipzig, 1929), p. 2.

He then went on to note that "it is particularly common in the books of Samuel".<sup>54</sup> Some years later, Curt Kuhl noted the existence of this literary procedure in the prophetic books as well, terming it "Wiederaufnahme".<sup>55</sup>

In the light of this literary technique of "re-sumptive repetition", the texts of MT, LXX and 4QSam must be examined with a view to determining whether it might account for some of the divergencies between these texts when a significant plus (or minus) is found in one of them.

When an editorial addition has been inserted into the text in this way, so that the first and last word or phrase are identical, and when the absence of the addition in the other texts would lead one to think that this absence might be explained by haplography, such a text may be designated "haplogenic". Its form is such that it could have generated the accidental omission of all that stands between the repeated word or phrase.

The purpose of the following study is to examine the significant pluses and minuses found in the text of MT, LXX, and 4QSam as well, in order to determine, where possible, the more original reading in each case, with special attention given to those cases in which a haplography might be the cause of its omission. For each of the cases considered we will attempt to determine, as well, the degree of certitude which may be obtained as to the original reading,<sup>56</sup> the motives for a textual change in the cases of those pluses or minuses which are judged not to be original, and the cause of textual accidents in those cases where one appears to have taken place.

---

<sup>54</sup> Wiener, Composition, p. 2.

<sup>55</sup> Curt Kuhl, "Die 'Wiederaufnahme' -- ein literarkritisches Prinzip?" ZAW 64 (1952) 1-11.

<sup>56</sup> Here again, Peters' study is deficient in that, although in his discussion of certain cases he qualifies them only as "wahrscheinlich", they are counted in his conclusions on the same level as those about which he is certain.

The First Part of this study consists of an analysis of those pluses which do not appear in "haplogenic" form, that is, whose absence from a text may not be attributable to a simple error due to homeoteleuton or homeoarcton. These are divided into, first of all, those instances in which a plus occurs in LXX which is "non-haplogenic" in form (Part 1.1), then those in which a plus occurs in MT which is "non-haplogenic" (Part 1.2), and, thirdly, those in 4QSam which are "non-haplogenic" (Part 1.3). A final section in Part 1 (1.4) is reserved for the pluses in the Greek text which are due to a double translation, as these are basically of a different nature, showing evidence of inner-Greek editorial activity.

The Second Part consists of those pluses in LXX (Part 2.1) and MT (Part 2.2) which are "haplogenic" in form.

In the General Conclusions the conclusions from each section will be compared in order to determine the nature of the texts of MT, LXX and 4QSam as far as these pluses or minuses are concerned. Further, the conclusions drawn from the examination of "haplogenic" pluses will enable us to determine whether all such cases are merely textual accidents, or whether, and to what extent, we may discern in them evidence of deliberate editorial activity.

This analysis is intended to be a partial contribution to our understanding of the nature of the texts of Samuel represented by MT, LXX and 4QSam. It is partial, first of all, since the only phenomenon under consideration here is the occurrence of significant pluses or minuses in one or more of these three texts.<sup>57</sup> It is partial, secondly, since only the lengthier and more significant pluses or minuses will be treated here. All of the one- or two-word pluses and many of the three-word pluses which Peters included have been omitted in order to concentrate on those which add significantly to the text.

---

57 For a discussion of the differences between MT and LXX, see Driver<sup>2</sup>, pp. lv-lxix. For the text of 4QSam see the articles by Cross and Ulrich referred to in notes 1 and 2 above.



## Texts and Versions

The Hebrew Massoretic text is that found in the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS),<sup>58</sup> which is based on the Leningrad Codex B 19<sup>A</sup> (dated 1008/9 A.D.).

The texts of the fragments of Samuel discovered in Cave IV at Qumran which are accessible at present are found in various publications by F. M. Cross<sup>59</sup> and E. C. Ulrich,<sup>60</sup> as well as, for 1 Samuel, in P. Kyle McCarter's commentary.<sup>61</sup>

For the Greek Septuagint translation (LXX) of Samuel, I have used the Cambridge edition of Brooke-McLean-Thackeray,<sup>62</sup> which reproduces, where not otherwise specified, the text of Codex Vaticanus B. For other books of the Bible in Greek, both the Cambridge<sup>63</sup> and the Göttingen<sup>64</sup> editions have been employed. The degree to which the "Old Greek" translation is actually accessible through manuscript evidence has been a subject of discussion ever since Lagarde's warning on the state of the Greek text found in the manuscripts.<sup>65</sup> For the non-kaigé<sup>66</sup> sections of Sam-Kgs, Codex

58 Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (Stuttgart, 1967-1977).

59 Cf. the articles by Cross cited in notes 1 and 2.

60 E. C. Ulrich, Jr., The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus (Ann Arbor, 1978) [QTSJ], in addition to his article cited in note 1.

61 Cf. note 35.

62 The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Vol II.: The Later Historical Books. Part I: I and II Samuel, edd. A. E. Brooke and N. McLean with H. St. J. Thackeray, (Cambridge, 1927).

63 The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus (Cambridge, 1906-1940).

64 Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum (Gottingen, 1931-1974).

65 See above, page 2.

66 On the kaigé and non-kaigé sections of the books of Sam-Kgs, see D. Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila (Leiden, 1963).

Vaticanus B is generally considered the best guide here,<sup>67</sup> while for the sections where Codex Vaticanus B contains the kaigé recension, the "Antiochian" text (Ant) found in mss b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> must be used as the starting point for this investigation.<sup>68</sup> In either case we must be content with the "oldest available Greek text"<sup>69</sup> based on manuscript evidence.

The Old Latin fragments are those cited by Vercellone (OL<sup>v</sup>),<sup>70</sup> by Sabatier,<sup>71</sup> and those appearing in the critical apparatus of the Cambridge text and of BHS.

For the Vulgate, the text edited by the monks of San Girolamo in Rome has been employed.<sup>72</sup> It will be cited only infrequently as it does not form an independent witness, but is occasionally a valuable guide to St. Jerome's understanding of the MT.

The text of the Targum Jonathan is that of Sperber's edition.<sup>73</sup> Here again, its usefulness is minimal

67 E. Tov, "Lucian and Proto-Lucian. Toward a New Solution of the Problem," RB 79(1972), p. 109.

68 For the text of these mss, I have followed Barthélemy's designation as "Antiochian" (Les Devanciers, p. 92) rather than Cross' "proto-Lucianic" ("History of the Biblical Text..."). Since both authors now agree that the Old Greek is lost for these sections (cf. Barthélemy, "Prise de Position sur les Autres Communications du Colloque de Los Angeles," in Etudes d'Histoire du Texte de l'Ancien Testament (Fribourg, 1978), p. 273), one must in any event examine each reading on its own merits in order to establish to what extent it represents the oldest available Greek text no matter which terminology is used.

69 Cf. Barthélemy, "Prise de Position...", p. 273.

70 C. Vercellone, Variae Lectiones Vulgatae Latinae Bibliorum 2 Vols., (Roma, 1860 and 1864).

71 P. Sabatier, Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae seu Vetus Italica 3 Vols., (Paris, 1751).

72 Biblia Sacra juxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem ad Codicum Fidem, Vol. V: Liber Samuhelis, (Romae, 1944).

73 The Bible in Aramaic, Vol II: The Former Prophets according to Targum Jonathan, ed. A. Sperber, (Leiden, 1959).

except as a confirmation of MT, but its occasional interpretative expansions are instructive.

The Syriac text is that prepared by the Peshiṭta Institute.<sup>74</sup> Driver noted that it "not infrequently" concurs with the text of Lucian.<sup>75</sup> As with the Targum Jonathan it is more important for its interpretative renderings than as witness to a text independent from MT.

Finally, the text of Josephus' Jewish Antiquities, important as a witness to the pre-Massoretic state of the Greek text, is that of the edition of Thackeray and Marcus.<sup>76</sup>

---

74 The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshiṭta Version, Part II, 2: Judges - Samuel, (Leiden, 1978).

75 Driver<sup>2</sup>, p. lxxi.

76 Josephus, Jewish Antiquities. Boks V-VIII. Vol V, tr. H. St. J. Thackeray and R. Marcus (London and Cambridge, MA, 1950). Cf. Ulrich, QTSJ, for a thorough analysis of Josephus' textual affinities and for his importance as a witness to the "proto-Lucianic" text.

## P A R T I

## "NON-HAPLOGENIC" PLUSSES

1.1 "Non-haplogenic" pluses in LXX

In this section we will examine those readings in which a plus is found in the Greek text vis-à-vis MT whose absence from the latter may not be ascribed to a simple error of homeoteleuton or homeoarcton.

1. Sam 1:5f.

MT: וְלִנְחָנָה יָתֵן מִנָּה חֹמֶס אִפִּים כִּי אֶת-חֲנָנִי אָהָב וַיְהִי שֶׁגֶר רַחֵם וְכִעֲסָהּ צָרָה גַּם-כָּעַס בַּעֲבוּר הָרַעְמָה כִּי-סֹגֵר יְהוָה בַּעַד רַחֵם<sup>5</sup>

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>5</sup>καὶ τὴν Ἀννὰ ἔδωκεν μερίδα μίαν, ὅτι οὐκ ἦν αὕτη παῖδιον, πλὴν ὅτι τὴν Ἀννὰν ἡγάπα Ἐλκὰνα ὑπὲρ ταύτην. καὶ Κύριος ἀπεκλείσεν τὰ περὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς, <sup>6</sup>ὅτι οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὕτη Κύριος παῖδιον, κατὰ τὴν θλιψὶν αὐτῆς καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀθυμίαν τῆς θλιψεως αὐτῆς· καὶ ἠθύμει δια τοῦτο, ὅτι συνεκλείσεν Κύριος τὰ περὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς, τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι αὕτη παῖδιον.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: <sup>5</sup>τὴ δὲ Ἀννὴ ἔδωκεν μερίδα μίαν κατὰ πρόσωπον, ὅτι οὐκ ἦν αὕτη παῖδιον· πλὴν ὅτι ἡγάπα ὁ Ἐλκὰνα τὴν Ἀννὰν ὑπὲρ τὴν Φέννανα, καὶ Κύριος ἀπεκλείσεν τὰ περὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς. <sup>6</sup>καὶ παρωργίζεν αὐτὴν ἡ ἀντιζηλὸς αὐτῆς καὶ γὰρ παρωργισμῷ δια τοῦ ἐξουθενεῖν αὐτὴν. καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν Κύριος αὕτη παῖδιον κατὰ τὴν θλιψὶν αὐτῆς καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀθυμίαν τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἠθύμει δια τοῦτο καὶ ἐκλαίεν, ὅτι συνεκλείσεν Κύριος τὰ περὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς, τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι αὕτη παῖδιον.

In these two verses we find a series of pluses in LXX which serve to emphasize the cause of Hannah's distress (v.5: ὅτι οὐκ ἦν αὕτη παῖδιον; Ἐλκὰνα ὑπὲρ ταύτην [Φέννανα - Ant]; v.6: ὅτι οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὕτη Κύριος παῖδιον; [καὶ ἐκλαίεν - Ant]; τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι αὕτη παῖδιον), plus a double translation of v.6b in Ant: καὶ παρωργίζεν -- δια τοῦ ἐξουθενεῖν αὐτὴν and κατὰ τὴν θλιψὶν -- τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς.

While Thenius noted in 1842 that the pluses of LXX were "appropriate", and suggested that they be taken into the text,<sup>1</sup> he dropped all reference to them in his second edition.<sup>2</sup> Even Peters, while claiming that they could have been intentionally dropped from MT, calls them additions,<sup>3</sup> and no author has accepted them as original. Vg, Tg and Syr all follow MT here as well.

The repetitiousness of these pluses is a clear sign that they are editorial additions, designed to underscore Hannah's plight of barrenness. In v.5 MT merely says that Elkanah gave Hannah only one portion while LXX spells out that the reason for her barrenness was that the Lord had not given her a child. This serves not only to dramatize her plight further, but also to set up the coming story in which Hannah will make her vow to the Lord if he gives her a child. LXX has also heightened the contrast and rivalry between Hannah and Peninnah by adding Ελκανα υπερ ταυτην, which Ant made even more explicit by inserting Peninnah's name.

LXX translated the problematic מִיָּאֵם, which it apparently found obscure,<sup>4</sup> as πλην while Ant, trying to approximate MT, added κατα προσωπον before the plus and preserved the OG πλην after it.

While the Greek text of v.5 is quite literal vis-à-vis MT once the pluses have been eliminated, v. 6 in cod B is problematic. A plus found only in mss b d g h o p q t z c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>o</sub>, και παρωριζεν αυτην η αντιζηλος αυτης και γε παροργισμω δια το εξουθενειν αυτην, provides a literal translation of MT הַמְגִדָּה בְּעֵינֶיךָ וְעָלְתָה בְּעֵינֶיךָ, followed, after the insertion οτι ουκ εδωκεν αυτη Κυριος παιδιον, by κατα την θλιψιν αυτης και κατα την αθυμιαν της ψυχης αυτης, which, by its position in cod B appears to render ηתצ הנהגת. After this, και ηθυμει

1 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 3.

2 Thenius<sup>2</sup>, p. 5.

3 Peters, p. 117.

4 Cf. McCarter: "LXX<sup>B</sup>, then, probably reflects a corruption of a text identical to MT, after which the explanatory plus ... arose." (p. 52). He goes on to point out that "it is unlikely that a straightforward conjunction like 'pes (kf)

δια τουτο in cod B (+και εκλαλεν in Ant) seems to be OG's attempt at הרעמה בעבור.

Wellhausen has rightly observed that LXX's και κατα την αθυμιαν της θλιψεως αυτης is a second translation for κατα την θλιψιν αυτης.<sup>5</sup> With και ηθυμει δια τουτο translating בעבור כעס-גם, LXX appears simply to have left the difficult הרעמה untranslated. Klostermann and Dhorme have suggested בעבור רחמה and Smith בעבור חרפה, but Driver has pointed out the meaning "to murmur, complain" for the root רעם in Tg and "to be indignant, complain, lament" in Syr, as well as "to anger" in Arabic,<sup>6</sup> and thus obtains a good meaning for MT.

If OG here, therefore, read κατα την θλιψιν αυτης και ηθυμει δια τουτο, it appears to have known a Hebrew Vorlage which was the same as, or similar to, MT, and its translation, as for אפים, shows that it tried to approximate the meaning as best as it could. Ant preserved the unintelligible text but first gave its own literal translation. Where the pluses occur in LXX, there is no clear indication of whether they show literary creativity on LXX's part or whether they were already found in its Vorlage. In any event, it is clear that the simpler MT narrative was embellished by several additions, whose absence from MT cannot be accounted for by textual accident, designed to emphasize Hannah's misery and to prepare the reader for the Lord's intervention later in the narrative with the birth of Samuel.

# 1 Sam 1.11

MT: ותדר נדר ותאמר יהוה צבאות אם-ראה תראה בעני אמתך וזכרתני ולא-תשכח את-אמתך ונתתה לאמתך זרע אנשים ונתתיו ליהוה כל-ימי חייך ומורה לא-יעלה על-ראשו.

---

could become altered to the obscure expression in MT (p. 54), which constitutes a good argument in favor of the obscure אפים, even if it does not explain its meaning.

5 Wellhausen, p. 36.

6 Driver, p. 10. Cf. Schulz, "widerwillig sein"; Hertzberg, "to humiliate her"; McCarter, "complain aloud," based on רעם "to thunder".

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ηϋξατο ευχην Κυριω λεγουσα Αδωναι Κυριε Ελθε  
 Σαβαωθ, εαν επιβλεπων επιβλεψης την ταπεινωσιν της  
 δουλης σου και μνησθης μου και δως τη δουλη σου  
 σπερμα ανδρων, και δωσω αυτον ενωπιον σου δοτον εως  
 ημερας θανατου αυτου· και οινον και μεθυσμα ου  
 πιεται, και σιδηρος ουκ αναβησεται επι την κεφαλην  
 αυτου.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ηϋξατο ευχην τω Κυριω των δυναμεων λεγουσα Αδωναι  
 Κυριε Ελωι Σαβαωθ, εαν επιβλεπων επιβλεψης επι την  
 ταπεινωσιν της δουλης σου και μνησθης μου και μη  
 επιλαθης της δουλης σου και δως τη δουλη σου σπερμα  
 ανδρος, και δωσω αυτον ενωπιον σου δοτον εως ημερας  
 θανατου αυτου, και οινον και μεθυσμα ου πιεται, και  
 σιδηρος ουκ αναβησεται επι την κεφαλην αυτου.

4QSam<sup>a</sup>:<sup>7</sup> [יְיָ יְיָ] לְיְהוָה וְיָשָׁא  
 [וְיָשָׁא לְיְיָ] וְיָשָׁא לְיְיָ וְיָשָׁא לְיְיָ וְיָשָׁא לְיְיָ

In Hannah's prayer for a son and her promise to con-  
 secrate him to the Lord, cod B omits יְהוָה-הָאֱלֹהִים, which  
 is present in Ant. Further on, the Greek text contains a  
 plus, και οινον και μεθυσμα ου πιεται, found in all Gk mss,  
 OL<sup>v</sup> and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, although it is absent from the Greek text of  
 Origen.<sup>8</sup> By far the majority of authors has opted for the  
 MT reading here, considering the OG minus to be either a  
 haplography or a deliberate omission, and the LXX plus a  
 deliberate insertion, inspired by Num 6:3 and/or the promise  
 of Samson's birth in Judg 13:4.<sup>9</sup> Houbigant maintained the  
 originality of the LXX plus, based on the argument that this  
 detail concerning wine and strong drink is usually not  
 omitted when a Nazirite vow is referred to.<sup>10</sup> Böttcher  
 attributed both the plus and minus in LXX to his "Laienre-  
 cension",<sup>11</sup> and Thenius, along the same lines as Houbigant,  
 retained the plus of LXX as being appropriate in the context  
 of a Nazirite vow.<sup>12</sup>

7 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 39.

8 Origen, *De Oratione*, in *Omnia Opera* I (Paris, 1733), p. 203.

9 Keil, Erdmann, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Hummelauer, Graetz,  
 Budde, Smith (although he omits the MT plus), Nowack,  
 Dhorme, Driver, Ehrlich, Schulz, Kittel, Hertzberg,  
 Stoebe, RSV, NEB, BJ, Osty, TOB, EÜ.

10 Houbigant, p. 285.

11 Böttcher, p. 90.

12 Thenius<sup>2</sup>. p. 5.

More recently, Cross, Ulrich and McCarter have accepted the originality of the plus on the basis of its presence in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.<sup>13</sup> Cross points out that 4Q contains an addition at 1:22 which explicitly refers to Samuel as a nazir and goes on to suggest that it may have been derived from 1:11.<sup>14</sup> Ulrich's reconstruction of 4Q here (see above) follows LXX, and the space considerations seem to warrant the presence of the plus in 4Q. LXX's  $\delta\omicron\tau\omicron\nu$ , further, appears to suggest an original  $\nu\zeta\iota\tau$ , in its Vorlage, although the word is a hapax in LXX.<sup>15</sup> Thus, LXX and 4Q seem to be in agreement on the presence of  $\nu\zeta\iota\tau$ , on the phrase "until the day of his death" instead of MT's "all the days of his life", and on the plus concerning the abstention from wine and strong drink.<sup>16</sup>

In MT, Samuel is not specifically referred to as a nazir, although the vow that "no razor shall touch his head" seems clearly to have been inspired by either Num 6:3 or Judg 13. The only Biblical text which refers to Samuel as nazir is the Hebrew Ben Sira 46:13.<sup>17</sup>

If we look carefully at the three principal textual witnesses here, MT, LXX and 4Q, we can see a clear progression in the portrayal of Samuel as nazir. In MT, Hannah's vow mentioned only that no razor would touch the head of the child. The promise of abstention from wine and strong drink,

13 Cross, BASOR 132, p. 18; Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 40; McCarter, pp. 53ff.

14 Cross, p. 18, although McCarter maintains that for v.11 "the insertion of nzyr, though entirely appropriate, is probably secondary, under the influence of v.22" (p. 54).

15 For  $\nu\zeta\iota\tau$  in Judg 13:5.7 and 16:17 cod B reads  $\nu\alpha\zeta\epsilon\iota\tau$  in 13:5, but  $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$  in 13:7 and 16:17. The majority of mss contains  $\nu\alpha\zeta\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota\omicron\nu$  in all three places. In the other uses of  $\nu\zeta\iota\tau$ :  $\alpha\gamma\iota\alpha\zeta\omega$  (Lev 25:5.11 Am 2:11f.);  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  (Num 6:13.18.19.20.21);  $\eta\eta\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$  (Gen 49:260;  $\alpha\gamma\upsilon\epsilon\iota\alpha$  (Num 6:3);  $\delta\omicron\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  (Deut 33:16);  $\nu\alpha\zeta\iota\tau\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$  (Lam 4:7).

16 Note, however, that the nazir's abstention from strong drink is found only at Num 6:3. In Judg 13:4.7.14, the order to abstain is given to Samson's mother, not to the future nazir.

17 Barthélemy points out that the Mishna (Nazir IV,5) also applies the term nazir to Samuel (Barthélemy, CTAT).



along with the formula "until the day of his death" (Cf. the same phrase in the context of the Samson narrative at Judg 13:7), which LXX contains, is clearly intended to enlarge the picture of the Nazirite. In LXX, in addition,  $\delta\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$ , which may indicate an original נזיר in LXX's Vorlage and which certainly strengthens the notion of giving the child to the Lord, emphasizes the Nazirite even more. The "naziritazion" of Samuel becomes complete in 4Q, with its explicit reference to nazir in v.22. Given the gradual inflation of references to Samuel as nazir, we should consider MT, where the reference is the most discreet, to be the earliest of the texts. This is especially true since there seems to be no textual accident which would account for the MT absence of the reference to wine and drink, nor for the variant in LXX "until the day of his death".

Further confirmation that LXX and 4Q have colored Hannah's vow in order to specify or intensify its Nazirite nature is found in 1:23, where for MT אַךְ יָקָם יְהוָה אֶת-דָּבָרוֹ LXX reads  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\iota \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron \epsilon\chi\epsilon\lambda\theta\omicron\nu \epsilon\kappa \tau\omicron\upsilon \sigma\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ , which is found in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> as well:  $\text{ה[יהוה] ה' ה' יוֹצֵא מִיָּד}$ .<sup>18</sup>

The expression אֶת-דָּבָרוֹ הָקִים occurs twenty times outside of 1 Sam 1:23, and is used to indicate the establishing of the Lord's word in all cases but one.<sup>19</sup> As far as the LXX and 4Q variant is concerned,  $\text{יָצָא מִפֶּה}$ , while it is used sixteen times where it refers to a vow made by an individual, never appears with the verb קָם.<sup>20</sup> On the other hand, we find the expression in the Babylonian Talmud, in the treatise Nederim, which cites the formula in Num 30:3, as an equivalent to a Nazirite vow.<sup>21</sup> Further, the treatise Nazir

18 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 71.

19 Num 23:19; Deut 9:5; 27:26; 1 Sam 3:12; 15:13; 2 Sam 7:25; 1 Kgs 2:4; 6:12; 8:20; 12:15; 2 Kgs 23:3.24; 2 Chr 6:10; 10:15; Isa 44:26; Jer 28:6; 29:10; 33:14; 34:18; Neh 9:8; Dan 9:12. Only at Neh 5:13 is it question of a man performing his own, and not a divine, promise.

20 Num 30:3; 32:24; Josh 6:10; Judg 11:36; 1 Sam 2:3; Isa 45:23; 48:3; 55:11; Jer 44:17; 51:44; Ez 34:10; Lam 3:38; Job 15:13; 37:2; 41:13; Est 7:8.

21 Nederim 2b in Babylonian Talmud (London, 1936), p. 5.

decrees that "A man is able to impose a Nazirite vow on his son, but a woman cannot impose a Nazirite vow on her son."<sup>22</sup> If Hannah's vow for Samuel was indeed Nazirite, or if it was intended to be specified as such in LXX, Elkanah, in keeping with the spirit of later tradition, would have had to confirm the promise which his wife was, of herself, unable to make.

As far as the problematic *נזיר* in MT is concerned, since it appears to be in contradiction with the fact that the Lord has not yet spoken, many have suggested relieving the difficulty by correcting to *נזיר*.<sup>23</sup> This, however, cannot be justified on the basis of LXX for, as we have seen, the reading there was quite different, and, further, it is hard to see how, if *נזיר* had been original in the text, it could have become the more difficult *נזיר*.<sup>24</sup>

Keil maintained MT here by suggesting that it probably referred to the word of Eli in v.17. The fact that Eli's word there refers to the confirmation that a son would be born, however, seems to discount this since in 1:23 Samuel has already been born. Schulz points out, against LXX and against an emendation to *נזיר*, that a vow must be fulfilled by the one who makes it, and it would not be right to ask Yahweh here to fulfil Hannah's vow.

The other uses of this expression concern Yahweh's fulfilling what he has promised and, in this light, Elkanah's prayer here, "But may the Lord establish his word", appears to be an equivalent to "May the Lord's will be done". If this is true, then the immediate context is important for the understanding of the prayer here. In v.22, Hannah has begged off going up to Shiloh with the child until he is weaned, which is certainly a legitimate reason for delay. In v.23, Elkanah agrees with her, but then adds the problematic phrase.

---

22 Nazir 28b in Babylonian Talmud (London, 1936), pp. 99f.

23 Cappel, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Driver, Graetz, Budde, Nowack, Smith, Kittel, Dhorme (1910), BJ<sup>1</sup>, NEB.

24 Keil, Erdmann, Schulz, Hertzberg, Dhorme (1956), BJ<sup>3</sup>, RSV, Osty, TOB, Eü read with MT.

In this context, this could be a gentle reminder to Hannah, in case the reason for her delay in bringing the child up might be an excuse in order to put off handing the child over to the Lord, that the condition of the Lord's giving the child to her was that it would be consecrated to him. When Elkanah says, "May the Lord's word be established" -- "May his will be done", he reminds her that she must go through with her promise. This would seem to be borne out as well by the use of  $\alpha\chi$  here by Elkanah, which otherwise does not seem to fit the context but, in the light of this interpretation, sets up a contrast between his agreeing with Hannah that she delay, but that she not forget that Yahweh's "word" must be accomplished.

Thus, for 1 Sam 1.11, LXX has transformed or emphasized this verse by specifying the Nazirite nature of Hannah's promise, a process found in 4Q as well. This transformation is borne out by LXX and 4Q v.23, where Elkanah gives the necessary confirmation to Hannah's vow in the formula which was considered as an equivalent to the vow. MT's shorter text at v.11 seems to be less explicit and less loaded down with the Nazirite overtones and, therefore, the earliest of the texts.

1 Sam 1:28 and 2:11a

MT: <sup>28</sup> וגם אנכי השאלתיו ליהוה כל-הימים אשר היה הוא שאול ליהוה  
<sup>11a</sup> וישיטחו שם ליהוה  
 וילך אלקנה הרמחה על-ביתו

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>28</sup> καὶ αὐτὸν τῷ Κυρίῳ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας αὐτοῦ, ὥστε αὐτὸς, <sup>11</sup> χρησιν τῷ Κυρίῳ.  
 καὶ κατέλιπεν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον Κυρίου, καὶ ἀπηλθεν εἰς Ἀρμαθαίμ.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: <sup>28</sup> καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ αὐτὸν τῷ Κυρίῳ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας αὐτοῦ, ὥστε αὐτὸς, χρησιν τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ <sup>11</sup> Κυρίῳ.  
 καὶ κατέλιπον αὐτὸν ἐνώπιον Κυρίου ἐκεῖ, καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ ἀπηλθον εἰς Ἀρμαθαίμ εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῶν.

4QSam<sup>a</sup>:<sup>25</sup> ] וגם אנכי השאלתיו ליהוה כול הימ[ים]  
[אשר חי שאול ליהוה ותעזב] הו שם ותשטחו ליהוה

As may be seen from the texts provided above, the witnesses to four major text traditions each present a slightly different reading for these two verses which describe the leaving of young Samuel at the sanctuary of Shiloh and his parent's subsequent departure. Scholars are in wide agreement that the Song of Hannah, 1 Sam 2:1-10, did not always occupy this place in the text, but was inserted at some date after our text had already been established, thus separating 1:28 from 2:11.<sup>26</sup> An eloquent indication of this is that the canticle is situated in a slightly different position in MT, LXX and 4Q. Since Wellhausen, authors have noted that *וַיִּשְׁחַח שָׁם לַיהוָה* of MT v.28b is lacking in the majority of Greek mss, that *καὶ κατέλειπεν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνωπιὸν Κυρίου* is lacking in MT 2:11, and that the subject of the verbs in LXX 2:11 is Hannah, whereas in MT Elkanah suddenly reappears at 2:11 as the subject of *וַיֵּלֶךְ*. Wellhausen, claiming that LXX has preserved the more original text, reconstructs *וַיִּנְחֵה ... לַיהוָה וַיֵּלֶךְ*, and points out that the LXX would not deliberately have lessened Elkanah's rôle in the proceedings, which it had so greatly enlarged in v.24.<sup>27</sup> Further on, in MT 2:11, he explains the mention of Elkanah's name as an "explicitum" in the text and, therefore, not original, since there is no corresponding name in LXX.<sup>28</sup>

Klostermann suggested that the *שם* of 1:28b is a remnant of *שמואל* and, therefore, the subject of *וַיִּשְׁחַח*, but, as Budde pointed out against this, throughout this section Samuel is only referred to as "the boy", and has no active rôle in the narrative.<sup>29</sup>

26 Cf. Thenius,<sup>1</sup> p. 7.

27 Wellhausen, p. 42, followed by Driver, Budde, Löhr, Nowack, Ehrlich, Smith, Dhorme, Kittel, Schulz (who proposes *וַיִּשְׁחַח* for *κατέλειπεν*), BJ<sup>1</sup>.

28 "Where an 'explicitum' [i. e., explicitly expressed name] in the Hebrew text appears over against an 'implicitum' in LXX, in general the bias should be against the 'explicitum'," Wellhausen, p.23.

29 Budde, KHAT, p. 13.

A certain number of authors, and most modern translations, have preferred the MT for these verses, although occasionally with slight modifications. Keil opted for MT as is, claiming that Elkanah was the unexpressed subject of וישחיו.<sup>30</sup>

Erdmann followed MT as well, reading however a plural for וישחיו.<sup>31</sup> Stoebe retained the MT masc. sg., without, however, specifying who the subject might be.<sup>32</sup>

With the publication of the fragment from Qumran containing these verses (or at least 1:28), the possibility that some form of both וישחיו and και κατελιπεν was original in the text must be taken into consideration, although in 4Q unmistakably reads וישחיו and, although 2:11 is not present in this fragment, and there is no more than the suffix of the verb which precedes וישחיו, Cross reads וישחיו שם [ויעזבו] ליהוה], basing his reconstruction on LXX and suggests this as the original reading.<sup>34</sup> He is followed by McCarter, who notes that "the presence of šam in MT indicates that the tradition behind it had some reference to the leaving of the child."<sup>35</sup> For 2:11, McCarter accepts Hannah as the subject of ו(ח)ל.

Of all the texts for these two verses, that of Ant is the fullest and most unified -- προσεκυνησαν τῷ Κυρίῳ occurs in both 1:28 and 2:11; all the verbs, προσεκυνησαν, κατελιπον, and απηλθον are in the plural, as well as εις τον οικον αυτων. This overloaded text form of Ant, however, belies its attempt at both fidelity to OG and accommodation to MT, as well as a desire to harmonize the contradictory elements, and may, therefore, be eliminated as a possible original reading.

---

30 Keil, p. 22.

31 Erdmann, p. 57. Cf. also Hummelauer, Fernandez, Böttcher, RSV, Dhorme (1956), BJ<sup>3</sup>, Hertzberg, NEB, Eü, TOB.

32 Stoebe, p. 98: "und er erbetete dort..."

33 Cross, BASOR 132, pp. 15-26.

34 Cross, BASOR 132, p. 26.

35 McCarter, p. 58.

After Ant, both cod B and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> present unified texts, and although they do not agree on word order, seem both to have considered Hannah as the subject of κατελιπεν and απηλθεν in Greek, and יה [יִתְּנָה] and יִהְיֶה in 4Q. This follows the logic of Wellhausen's reasoning that LXX enlarged Elkanah's rôle in other places (Cf. 1 Sam 1:19; 2:20), and so, seemingly, would not have deliberately reduced it here had it been original in the text. What Wellhausen overlooked, however, is that LXX seems to have been interested not simply in enlarging Elkanah's rôle, but rather in harmonizing and clarifying what appeared to it as obscure or contradictory statements. Furthermore, Wellhausen's explanation seems to pass over the possibility that the insertion of the Song of Hannah in 2:1-10 might have resulted in giving her a larger rôle in the verses immediately preceding and immediately following her song. The text of cod B seems clearly to make her the subject. The mss c x have increased her presence even more, as they read: v.28 και προσεκυνησεν αυτω Αννα; and 2:11 και κατελιπεν Αννα εκει τον Σαμουηλ ενωπιον Κυριου και απηλθεν εις Αρμαθαιμ εις τον οικον αυτης. Thus, if we take, in the Gk manuscript tradition, cod B as our point of departure, the other mss seem to go in two directions. Ant tends to bring the text closer to MT and to harmonize with plural subjects; mss c x tend to push OG even further toward reading Hannah as subject. If this second process is a result of the presence of the song, we should consider that any text which moves away from this tendency has the greater likelihood of being closer to the original. If Hannah had been the original subject of the verbs in 1:28 and 2:11, there is no reason why she should have been abandoned in later editions. MT is certainly the lectio difficilior in both verses with יִהְיֶה in 1:28 and the sudden mention of Elkanah alone in 2:11. By this very fact, however, it seems more logical to consider LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> as various attempts to relieve this tension in the text and to make it conform more closely to the presence of Hannah's song. The same reasoning may apply for κατελιπεν in LXX: the emphasis on Hannah may have stimulated an editor to specify the fact that she left Samuel there with

Eli. The fact that evidence of this verb is found in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> would suggest that this modification of the text was present already in LXX's Vorlage rather than being a sign of the translators' activity. The change in word order in 4Q may be seen as an attempt to make the narrative more logical as well. In LXX (Ant) we read *καὶ προσεκύνησαν ... καὶ κατελίπον ... καὶ προσεκύνησαν*, whereas 4Q reads *וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ וַיֵּשְׁבּוּ [וַיֵּצְאוּ]*. Ant, as we have seen, has filled out the text, but perhaps 4Q thought it more logical for Hannah to leave the child before her prostration, which becomes then a sign of leave-taking.

As far as MT *וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ* is concerned, if Hannah is excluded as the original subject, there are still four possibilities -- Elkanah, Samuel, Eli or, reading the verb as plural,<sup>36</sup> Elkanah and Hannah together. The majority of recent translators prefers the plural here.<sup>37</sup> Keil opted for Elkanah as subject, and Klostermann for Samuel. Barthélemy, following the grammarians Japheth ben-Ali and Joseph Qara, takes Eli as subject, his prostration being a gesture of acceptance of the child.<sup>38</sup> None of these suggestions requires a change in the consonantal text, and the choice must be based on one's appreciation of the scene. That both parents are involved in the sacrifice accompanying the offering of the child (v.25), along with the plural *וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ* in v.19, makes it seem more likely that this verb in v.28 should read as plural as well. This, at least, was how both Vg (et adoraverunt) and Syr (wsgdw) understood the text.

There seems therefore, to be no reason for accepting any other text than that of MT as the original reading here for these two verses. The other textual traditions have modified the scene in order to make it appear more logical and to fit its surroundings by giving Hannah a larger rôle in the proceedings. Because of the similarity between LXX and 4Q here it is likely that LXX's reading goes back to its Hebrew Vorlage.

36 Cf. Gen 27:29; 43:28; 1 Kgs 9:9, *וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ* is read as plural and translated as plural in LXX as well.

37 See note 31.

38 Barthélemy, CTAT.

## 1 Sam 3:20-4:1a

MT: וידע כל-ישראל מִדֹּן וְעַד-בָּאָר שֶׁבַע כִּי נֶאֱמַן שְׁמוֹאֵל לְנָבִיא לַיהוָה <sup>20</sup>  
 וְיִשְׁרָאֵל יִהְיֶה לְהִרְאָה בְּשֵׁלָה כִּי-נִגְלָה יְהוָה אֶל-שְׁמוֹאֵל בְּשֵׁלֹו בְּדַבַּר יְהוָה <sup>21</sup>  
 וַיְהִי דְבַר-שְׁמוֹאֵל לְכָל-יִשְׂרָאֵל. <sup>1</sup>

LXX<sup>B</sup>: 20 και εγνωσαν πας Ισραηλ απο Δαν και εως Βηρσαβее οτι πιστος Σαμουηλ εις προφητην τω Κυριω. <sup>21</sup> και προσεθετο Κυριος δηλωθηναι εν Σηλωμ, οτι απεκαλυφθη Κυριος προς Σαμουηλ· και επιστευθη Σαμουηλ προφητης γενεσθαι τω Κυριω εις παντα Ισραηλ απ' ακρων της γης και εως ακρων. και Ηλει πρεσβυτης σφοδρα, και οι υιοι αυτου πορευομενοι επορευοντο, και πονηρα η οδος αυτων ενωπιον Κυριου. <sup>1</sup> και εγενηθη εν ταις ημεραις εκειναις και συναθροιζονται αλλοφυλοι εις πολεμον επι Ισραηλ.

The sizeable plus in LXX and the divergencies between MT and LXX (Ant here contains no significant variant from cod B) present us with several textual problems at once for these verses. An inventory of the variants shows that:

1. 3:21: LXX contains a plus which is, in reality, a double translation (και επιστευθη ... εως ακρων) of v.20.
2. 3:21: LXX contains another plus (και Ηλει...ενωπιον Κυριου).
3. 3:21: MT contains a plus (יהוה בדבר ישלו).
4. 4:1a MT and LXX contain different readings here.

1. Already Thenius had seen that και επιστευθη... εως ακρων is another translation for v.20,<sup>39</sup> and Wellhausen furthered this observation by showing that the additional sentence in v.21 formed part of the original LXX, while it is further away from MT (v.20) grammatically and it is connected with what follows in the Greek (και Ηλει etc.)<sup>40</sup> The literal Greek translation of v.20 would thus, according to this reasoning, be a later one. The double translation in v.21, however seems to be more of a paraphrase than an actual translation of the MT. Budde suggested that LXX v.21 presumes as original וַיֵּאמֶן שְׁמוֹאֵל לְהִיּוֹת נָבִיא לַיהוָה אֶל-כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל מִקֶּצֶה הָאָרֶץ <sup>41</sup> וַיֵּדַע קָצָה. Klostermann, however, suggested that this phrase was originally written as a marginal note for the "ausserpalästininische Leser",<sup>42</sup> which may well have been the case. The

39 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 16.

40 Wellhausen, p. 54.

41 Budde, KHAT. p. 29.

42 Klostermann, p. 12.



phrase *מקצה הארץ ועד קצה הארץ* occurs at Deut 13:8; 28:64; Jer 12:12; 25:33 (cf. also Gen 47:21), but never in the context of defining the borders of Israel. On the other hand, *ועד באר-שבע* occurs, sometimes with slight variations, at Judg 20:1; 2 Sam 3:10; 17:11; 24:2.15; 1 Kgs 5:5; 1 Chr 21:2; 2 Chr 30:5, and in each of these places LXX has translated literally according to MT. It may be, therefore, against Wellhausen, that this LXX plus is not a remnant of OG which had been displaced by a second translation, but rather an addition inspired by the apparent similarity to the classical phrase "from Dan to Beer-Sheba" which delimited Israel's boundaries and which was intended to specify what was meant by the phrase for readers who were not familiar with the terrain, as Klostermann suggested. There is, therefore, no reason to accept LXX here as a preferable or more original reading.

2. The second plus in LXX v.21 here gives us an historical note on Eli's great age and on the wicked conduct of his sons. Thenius relocated the plus after 4:1a (MT), and then suggested that the sentence, joined with what appears in LXX 4:1a, fell out through a scribe's error in passing over from *על-ישראל* to *לכל-ישראל*<sup>43</sup>. This explanation is unsatisfying, however, as it requires the rearrangement of the order of verses so that they correspond to no known textual witness. If the order in MT and in LXX is held to, no simple textual error can account for the plus' absence from MT.

Eli and his sons are first introduced in 1:3, where they are simply identified as priests of the Lord at Shiloh. Then in 2:12-17 they reappear in an interlude which describes the malpractice of the sons with regard to the offerings made to the Lord. This interlude is circumscribed by vv. 11 and 18, both of which describe the boy Samuel ministering to the Lord. In 2:22-25, Eli hears of the wickedness of his sons, followed by, in v.26, the notice of Samuel growing in stature and favor before God and man. Then 2:27-36

<sup>43</sup> Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 16.

contains the prophecy by the man of God against the house of Eli, with the promise of raising up a faithful priest. By this time, because of the alternating and contrasting scenes which oppose the wicked conduct of Eli's sons to the goodness of Samuel, it is obvious to the reader that at least the immediate intention of the series of oppositions is that Samuel is indicated as the faithful priest.<sup>44</sup> The call of Samuel follows in 3:1-18, along with the Lord's message to him (3:10-14) which confirms the condemnation of Eli's house. Then 3:19-21 (or to 4:1a) is a description of Samuel's prophetic activity. This, in MT, is a summary statement which rounds out the story of the beginning of Samuel's prophetic career, which is not resumed until 7:3, after the ark narrative. In LXX, however, the mention of Eli and his wicked sons serves to continue the series of alternating contrasts between them and Samuel. In this context, especially as Samuel departs from the scene until 7:3, it would seem more natural that the narrative "wind down" with a summary statement rather than with the continuation of the oppositions which marked the text all along. A later scribe's sense of symmetry, however, may have inspired him to insert the plus here where Samuel is mentioned for the last time in this narrative. Hophni and Phinehas, however, are sufficiently dealt with in 4:11 so that a reminder of their wickedness is not needed at 3:21. Further, MT's rapid transition from Samuel the Prophet in 3:21-4:1a to the Philistine war and capture of the ark, beginning in 4:1b, contrasts with LXX's apparent desire to set the scene for chapter 4 by calling attention in LXX 3:21 to Eli's advanced age and to his sons' extreme wickedness. By the very rapidity of its transition, the MT is more likely to be the original form here.<sup>45</sup>

3. The phrase *בשלו בירר יהוה* has caused difficulty because it is hard to see either how it can be the continuation of what immediately precedes or how it can introduce what follows. Wellhausen pointed out that, as an explanation of "for the Lord revealed himself to Samuel" in

<sup>44</sup> Although this does not appear to be the final intention of this passage. See on 1 Sam 2:31f., below.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Barthélemy, CTAT.

v.21, it is a phrase which seems to "prevent anthropomorphic misunderstandings."<sup>46</sup> He claimed, further, that if it followed immediately from what precedes, a personal suffix would have been used instead of the repetition of יהוה. Houbigant had already rejected כדבר יהוה while maintaining בשלו<sup>47</sup> and Wellhausen went on to reject the originality of all three words.<sup>48</sup> Dhorme omitted בשלו as a repetition of its first occurrence, and then saw in כדבר יהוה a remnant of LXX's plus concerning Eli and his sons, without, however, explaining how the latter might have given rise to כדבר יהוה.<sup>49</sup>

The phrase is defended by Keil, who understood it as an explanatory statement, and is maintained in its integrity by Stoebe, who claims that בשלו serves to underline the fact that these events concerning Samuel were closely connected with Shiloh.<sup>50</sup> Neither of them make any comment, however, on the seemingly exaggerated triple repetition of Yahweh in the verse.

Kittel reads כדבר יהוה (along with 3 codd of Kennicott and 11 of de Rossi) and transposes it after 4:1a.<sup>51</sup> Hertzberg adopts the same reading, although he relocates it slightly differently: "4:1a. Thus the word of Samuel was as the word of the Lord to all Israel".<sup>52</sup>

Thus, no completely satisfactory sense is made out of this phrase unless its position is changed somehow. In order to arrive at what may have been the original reading here, it is necessary to surmise that, since only this phrase and 4:1a MT are actually missing from LXX, despite all the other differences between the two texts for these verses, the lot of these two variants should be thrown in together.

---

46 Wellhausen, p. 54.

47 Houbigant, p. 289.

48 Followed by Smith, Budde, Schulz, McCarter.

49 Dhorme (1910), p. 45.

50 Keil, p. 39. Stoebe, p. 123

51 Kittel, in BH<sup>3</sup>. In BH<sup>1</sup> (1905) he omitted the words with LXX.

52 Hertzberg, p. 40.

Neither *נשלו בידו יהוה* nor *נשלו בידו* seems a likely way to begin not only a new sentence but a whole new section in the narrative, and it may have been this difficulty which led the early interpreters of the text to place the words with v.21b (cf. the Massoretic text division), even though they are tautological and seem to overload the text. Taken with 4:1a, however, the phrase serves both to locate Samuel's word to all Israel, at Shiloh, and to specify the fact that Samuel's word was indeed that of the Lord. For these reasons, therefore, it seems best to put *נשלו בידו יהוה* with 4:1a MT, although an examination of the latter is necessary in order to determine its originality in the text.

4. 4:1a presents us with two different texts in MT and LXX: *ויהי דבר-שמואל לכל ישראל* and *καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐταῖς καὶ συναθροίζονται ἄλλοφυλοι εἰς πόλεμον ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ*. As we saw above, Thenius claimed a textual accident here, in which the sentence of LXX would have fallen out through homeoteleuton. It does not seem necessary, however, to have recourse to an imaginary, rearranged text in order to explain the MT-LXX variant here. A comparison of the two texts shows a much greater likelihood that the MT is the more original. The expression *ויהי דבר-שמואל לכל-ישראל* is rather surprising here since one would expect "the word of the Lord", not that of Samuel. The formula *ויהי דבר-יהוה* occurs eighty-eight times in the Bible,<sup>53</sup> while *ויהי דבר* with a human person occurs only here.<sup>54</sup> The preposition is usually *אל*, although in some cases we find *לכל-ישראל*. The frequency of the expression with *דבר-יהוה*, plus the absolute singularity of its use here with a human regens for *דבר*, makes it hard to see how the expression in Mt could not be original, since it hardly would have been invented and introduced at a later date. What one would

53 Gen 15:1; 1 Sam 15:10; 2 Sam 7:21; 14:7; 1 Kgs 6:11; 13:20; 16:1; 17:2.8; 18:31; 21:17.28; 2 Chr 11:2, plus once in Isa, 21 times in Jer, 41 in Ez, twice in Jon, three times in Hag and seven in Zech.

54 In 2 Sam 3:17 we have *וידבר אבנר היה עם זקני ישראל*, but the formula is not the same as in 1 Sam 4:1.

rather expect at a later date would be modification of the expression, either by the (perhaps originally marginal) notation **בדבר יהוה**, in order to assure the orthodoxy of the phrase, or by a complete change such as we find in LXX. Its form of 4:1a does indeed provide an introduction to what follows, but it is hard to see how a more common introductory formula could have been replaced by the theologically problematic **דבר שמואל**.

Against the view that MT 4:1a is merely the continuation of the general description of Samuel's prophetic activity from 3:19-21, it may be pointed out that the use of the inverted imperfect **ויהי** in order to introduce a new scene is found as well at 1 Sam 1:1; 8:1; 9:1; 15:10; 28:1.

A final point in favor of the originality of MT 4:1a is that, when taken as a call to arms addressed by Samuel to the Israelites, while in the LXX form the Philistines are the first to amass against Israel. It is much more plausible to see a change in the text which would seek to exculpate the Israelites and place the fault with the Philistines rather than vice versa.

For these reasons, therefore, we can accept the MT form of 4:1a as the more original and as a call to arms by Samuel addressed to all Israel. The LXX editors (or already its Vorlage), shocked perhaps by the formula which elsewhere is reserved only for Yahweh, replaced it with another introduction which both eliminated the theologically offensive phrase and at the same time gave the initiative in the war to the Philistines. The final phrase of MT 3:21 would then be a later addition to the Hebrew text designed to explain and justify the unusual **דבר-שמואל ויהי**.

#### 1 Sam 8:18

MT: וזעקתם ביום ההוא מלפני מלככם אשר בחרתם לכם ולא-יענה  
יהוה אתכם ביום ההוא

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και βοησασθε εν τη ημερα εκεινη εκ προσωπου βασι-  
λεως υμων ου εξελεξασθε εαυτοις· και ουκ επακου-  
σεται Κυριος υμων εν ταις ημεραις εκειναις, οτι  
υμεις εξελεξασθε εαυτοις βασιλεια.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και βοησατε εν τη ημερα εκεινη εκ προσωπου του βασι-  
λεως υμων ου ηρετισασθε εαυτοις, και ουκ επακουσεται  
υμων Κυριος εν ταις ημεραις εκιναις, οτι υμεις  
ητησαστε εαυτοις βασιλεα.

When Samuel points out the difficulties that will result from Israel's desire to have a king, the LXX text repeats the phrase, "for you have chosen for yourselves a king."<sup>55</sup> Thenius accepted it as "wholly suitable" to the original text,<sup>56</sup> while Wellhausen styled it as the same type of addition as is found in 1 Sam 1:5.<sup>57</sup> Peters suggested that it might have been excised from the text because the plus contains "acute irony",<sup>58</sup> although he offers no reason why MT might not have wanted to maintain the irony here. The majority of authors either reject the plus or simply take no notice of it,<sup>59</sup> while McCarter points out that it does not appear in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> with this verse.<sup>60</sup>

There is no discernible reason why the plus, if it had been original, should have been omitted, nor is there any indication of a textual accident here. On the other hand, it seems to have been inspired by the context, especially by v.18 itself where almost the same phrase occurs in the first half (אשר בחרת לנך). The Greek text seems simply to have repeated the phrase in order to emphasize Samuel's opposition to the establishment of a king over Israel. Ant, which had already translated בחרת differently from OG (ηρετισασθε εξελεξασθε), used still another verb, ητησασθε, having perhaps wanted to vary the repetitiousness of the Greek.

The lack of apparent conditions for a textual accident plus the nature of the phrase as a near repetition of

---

55 The plus is found in all Greek mss, but placed under ÷ in c<sub>2</sub>. That it was in OL as well is attested to by its presence in a large number of Vg mss (L<sup>2</sup>ΠΣΒΕΘ<sup>2</sup>HASMGP<sup>2</sup>HK<sup>2</sup>ΓΨQ<sup>2</sup>SM).

56 Thenius<sup>2</sup>, p. 29, followed by Klostermann.

57 Wellhausen, p. 70.

58 Peters, p. 124.

59 Thus Keil, Erdmann, Nowack, Graetz, Driver, Smith, Fernandez, Schulz, Kittel, Stoebe, HOTTP, RSV, NEB, NAB, BJ, Osty, TOB, Eü.

60 McCarter, p. 155.

v.18a in order to give emphasis are signs that the plus is an addition to the text and should not be taken as original.

1 Sam 12:23

MT:           גם אנכי חלילה לי מחטא ליהוה מחדל להתפלל בעדכם והוריתי אתכם בדרך הטובה והישרה

LXX<sup>B</sup>:       και εμοι μηδαμως του αμαρτειν τω Κυριω ανιεναι του προσευχεσθαι περι υμων· και δουλευσω τω Κυριω, και δειξω υμιν την οδον την αγαθην και την ευθειαν.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>:     εμοι δε μη γενοιτο του αμαρτειν τω Κυριω, του διαλιπειν προσευχομενον υπερ υμων τω Κυριω. και δουλευσωμεν τω Κυριω, και δηλωσω υμιν την οδον την αγαθην και την ευθειαν.

While the people repent of having asked for a king and Samuel encourages them to continue serving the Lord, LXX contains a small plus, και δουλευσω τω Κυριω, which only Thenius, Peters and Schulz have held as original. Thenius points out the "excellent contrast with ליהוה מחטא";<sup>61</sup> Peters suggests that an original ליהוה ונענתי might have fallen out due to the similarity with כעדים;<sup>62</sup> and Schulz notes that "only under the supposition that he is a true servant of Yahweh does Samuel believe he is in a position to teach the people the right way."<sup>63</sup> Most commentators pass over the plus in silence, although Klostermann suggested that it may have arisen from an original ונענתי,<sup>64</sup> and Dhorme proposed an inner-Greek misunderstanding, arising from an original δηλωσω in the Greek text.<sup>65</sup> Both of these suggestions, however, are based on the Ant form of the text (δουλευσωμεν and δηλωσω) and could not have arisen from that of cod B, which is the older text here.

<sup>61</sup> Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 42.

<sup>62</sup> Peters, p. 126.

<sup>63</sup> Schulz I, p. 174.

<sup>64</sup> Klostermann, p. 39.

<sup>65</sup> Dhorme (1910) p. 106.

In vv. 20 and 24 Samuel exhorts the people to serve the Lord, and this exhortation may be sufficient to account for the LXX form in v.23. In v.19, when the people impute evil to themselves in having asked for a king, Samuel reassures them (v.20) by telling them to serve the Lord and all will be well. Thus, for him, the only context in which it was acceptable for Israel to have a king was one in which service of the Lord was paramount. The plus in LXX serves to emphasize this attitude. There is no reason to suspect a textual accident here, and the addition emphasizes Samuel's condition for a tolerable kingship by having him proclaim his own service of the Lord.

1 Sam 14:23b-24

MT: והמלחמה עברה את-בית און <sup>24</sup> ואיש-ישראל נגש ביום ההוא <sup>23b</sup>  
 ויא' שאל את-העם לאמר ארור האיש אשר-יאכל לחם עד-הערב...

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>23b</sup> και ο πολεμος διηλθεν την βαμωθ, και πας ο λαος ην  
 μετα Σαουλ ως δεκα χιλιαδες ανδρων· και ην ο πολεμος  
 διεσπαρμενος εις ολην πολιν εν τω ορει τω Εφραιμ.<sup>24</sup>  
 και Σαουλ ηγνοησεν αγνοιαν μεγαλην εν τη ημερα εκεινη,  
 και αραται τω λαω λεγων, Επικαταρατος ο ανθρωπος ος  
 φαγεται αρτον εως εσπερας ...

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ο πολεμος διηλθεν Βαιθωρων, και Ισραηλ ην μετα  
 Σαουλ ωσει δεκα χιλιαδες ανδρων. [then, as cod B]

The MT and LXX present us with two different texts describing the battle against the Philistines and Saul's interdiction against eating until he avenges himself of his enemies. LXX contains a plus at the end of v.23, after which its reading differs from MT. The majority of exegetes has accepted the originality of the plus,<sup>66</sup> while others, along with most of the recent translations, have preferred the shorter MT.<sup>67</sup> Wellhausen offered the following retroversion

66 Houbigant, Thenius, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Driver, Peters, Budde, Nowack, Smith, Dhorme, McCarter, NAB.

67 Graetz, Keil, Erdmann, Hummelauer, Ehrlich, Hertzberg, Schulz, RSV, NEB, BJ<sup>3</sup>, Osty, TOB, Eü.



וכל-העם היה עם שאול כעשרת אלפים איש וזהי המלחמה: vv.23b-24. <sup>68</sup> בפועל. He himself expressed uncertainty about the final clause, since שגגה occurs only in the Pentateuch and Eccl,<sup>69</sup> and Smith pointed out that it is "a technical term conveying a distinction not emphasized before the Priestcode."<sup>70</sup> Klostermann conjectured that ἡγγοήσεν ἄγνοσαν was originally ἡγγοήσεν ἀγνοίαν, which he restored as אָגָר אָגָר.<sup>71</sup> Budde, while accepting Klostermann's Greek conjecture, suggested either הָזִיר נָזַר (based on Num 6:1ff.) or נָזַר נָזַר.<sup>72</sup> Driver, although he agreed that "committed a great error" fits poorly in the context, pointed out that Budde's conjecture, which would mean "separated a great (ceremonial) separation," i.e., imposed a great abstinence, is weak because "though it might perhaps have borne the meaning proposed, does not actually occur with it."<sup>73</sup> The problem of retroversion here is difficult, as αγνοειν occurs with six different Hebrew verbs at its base.<sup>74</sup>

The conjecture of Wellhausen is based, as Dhorme pointed out, on a confusion in MT of ושאול with the abbreviation of ויאל ישראל and on discerning vestiges of שגגה in נגש,<sup>75</sup> both of which are rather precarious procedures. Schulz suggested that ἡγγοήσεν ἄγνοσαν might have come from a double translation in Greek, in which ויאל was first translated as niphal.<sup>76</sup> This does not explain why LXX omitted the previous sentence, but at least has the merit of being a

68 Here Thenius had included בכל-היער for εἰς ὅλην πόλιν, where a copyist's error had produced העיר.

69 Wellhausen, p. 90.

70 Smith, p. 117.

71 Klostermann, p. 48.

72 Budde, SBOT and KHAT, followed by Smith and BJ<sup>1</sup>.

73 Driver, p. 112.

74 שגגה, שגג, רשע, niphal, סכל niphal, יאל, אשם.

75 Dhorme (1910), p. 119.

76 Schulz I, p. 203. Cf. Num 12:11, where נואלנו is translated as ἡγγοήσαμεν; "We have acted foolishly."

conjecture based on what is actually found in the text. Löhr objected to the procedure of reading with a widely divergent Greek text simply because of a difficulty in understanding one word in Hebrew (נגש), and concluded that v.24 in MT contains a corruption, but one which cannot be corrected on the basis of the LXX, which contains a different recension.<sup>77</sup>

Among the ancient versions, v.24 has been rendered by OL<sup>V</sup>: Et Saul ignoravit ignorantiam magnam in illa die,<sup>78</sup> and by Vg: Et vir Israhel sociatus sibi est in die illa, having read שגשג - "draw near". Tg follows MT with אדחיק - "be distressed", while Syr has changed the text substantially: "When the battle moved between Aven and the men of Israel, Saul, arriving on that day, said to the people, 'Accursed ...'"<sup>79</sup> The majority of modern translations have followed MT's shorter reading, and have rendered נגש with MT. Seebass has proposed the following correction in the text: ואיש ישראל נגש עם שאול כעשרת אלפים איש ושאול שגה שגגה ביום ההוא and attributed the loss in MT to an accident through homeo-arcton.<sup>80</sup>

It is clear from the emendations proposed for v.24, leaving aside the intervening LXX plus for a moment, that the question turns around נגש in MT and the alternate reading for ואיש ישראל נגש which LXX contains (και Σαουλ ηγνοησεν αγνοιαν μεγαλην εν τη ημερα εκεινη). If נגש means "to be distressed", the logic of MT seems to be perfectly in order. Although God "delivered Israel that day" (v.23), the war was not over and, as the battle spread to Beth-Aven, the Israelites could well have found themselves still in trouble.

77 Löhr, p. 61.

78 OL<sup>V</sup> also contains the plus at the end of v.23: Et proelium transit Bethoron, et ex Israel erat cum Saul quasi XII. millia virorum. et erat proelium dispersum tota civitatae in monte Ephrem, which follows LXX except for the twelve thousand men instead of LXX's ten thousand.

79 wqrb' Cbr wlhwn byt 'wn lgbr' d'ysr'yl wqrb š'wl kywm' hw. w'mr l'm' lyt.

80 H. Seebass, "Zum Text von 1 Sam XIV, 23B-25A und II 29, 31-33," VT 16 (1966), pp. 74f. He rejects LXX και ην ο πολεμος διεσπαρμενος εις ολην πολιν εν τω ορει τω Εφραιμ as a "mere repetition and elucidation of v.21f" (p. 74).

Another occurrence of  $\text{שָׁן}$ , in 1 Sam 13:6, describes precisely the same kind of situation. The problem here in 14:23f. is not so much justifying a difficult MT, but rather explaining LXX, for the possibility of a textual accident from which MT could have resulted from LXX does not seem plausible here.

While LXX appears to flow smoothly, its text nevertheless contains a certain number of problems. The sudden increase of Saul's forces from six hundred (14:2) to ten thousand seems unlikely. Further, the accusation that Saul acted stupidly does not fit in well with the rest of the narrative. A striking literary resemblance to LXX's plus here is found in 2 Sam 18:3.6.8. In v.3, David's men tell him, "You are worth ten thousand men to us"; in v.6, David's army goes out against Israel, led by Absalom, "in the forest of Ephraim"; and, in v.8, we are told that "the battle spread over the face of the whole country."

The number ten thousand men occurs in Sam only at 14:23 (>MT), 15:4 and 2 Sam 18:3, so it is hardly a commonly used round figure in Sam to describe Israel's forces. The "forest of Ephraim" occurs only at 2 Sam 18:6, and the term  $\text{נֶפֶץ}$ , as applied to a battle which is scattered over the country, is found only at v.8. The literary resemblance here seems too close to be overlooked, although why this scene from David's war against Absalom should have been evoked here in 1 Sam 14 is not immediately evident.

As we saw above, Wellhausen had proposed  $\text{נֶפֶץ בְּהָרִים}$  in his retroversion, as he considered  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \omicron\lambda\eta\nu \pi\omicron\lambda\iota\nu$  a double translation of  $\epsilon\nu \tau\omega \sigma\omicron\pi\epsilon\iota \tau\omega \epsilon\phi\phi\alpha\iota\mu$ .<sup>81</sup> Based on 2 Sam 18:6,  $\text{בִּיעַר אֶפְרַיִם}$ , however, the reading in LXX 1 Sam 14:23b may attest to a corruption already in its Vorlage from  $\text{בְּכָל הָעֵרִי}$  to  $\text{בְּכָל הָעֵרִי}$ , as Thenius had suggested (see note 68). If a forest had originally been referred to in LXX's Vorlage this may shed light on vv.25ff. as well, where a play on the words for "forest" ( $\text{יַעַר}$ ) and "honeycomb" ( $\text{יַעַר}$ ) seems to

<sup>81</sup> Wellhausen, p. 90.

be intended. If such is the case, then the moving of the battle into the forest of the hill of Ephraim in LXX 14:23 may have served as an introduction in order to explain why all of a sudden the scene shifts to the forest where Saul imposed the restriction against eating on the people and where the honey was the occasion of their temptation.

The interdiction against eating, which led to Jonathan's downfall as well as to the silence of the oracle in 14:37, may have been the occasion of the additional commentary in LXX's text that Saul acted stupidly, again serving as an introduction to those scenes.

The lack of conditions that could have led to a textual accident seems to be a clear sign that this plus was not in proto-MT. The great literary similarity with 2 Sam 18, plus the fact that LXX's text smooths the way for the incident of the honey in the forest in 14:24-30, are strong indications that LXX, or more probably its Vorlage, had added this plus.

#### 1 Sam 19:22

MT: ...ויתנבאו גם-המה: <sup>22</sup>וילך גם-הוא הרמתה...

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>21</sup>... και επροφητευσαν και αυτοι. <sup>22</sup>και εθυμωθη οργη Σαουλ, και επορευθη και αυτος εις Αρμαθαιμ.

This short plus of LXX, where there is no variation between cod B and Ant, has been accepted as original by Thenius, Klostermann, Smith, Peters and Dhorme (in 1910, but rejected in 1956), on the grounds that it is a suitable clause in this context. Budde noted the suitability as well but did not commit himself on its authenticity, while Kittel (BH<sup>3</sup>) merely noted fortasse. Wellhausen, in giving his opinion against the plus, laid down a principle for others of this type: "The only thing not understandable is the occasion of its disappearance in MT; the insertion is, as almost always, so here also, much easier to understand."<sup>82</sup> This plus was

<sup>82</sup> "Man begreift nur nicht die Veranlassung ihres Ausfalls in MT.; die Hinzufügung ist, wie fast immer, so auch hier, viel leichter zu verstehen," Wellhausen, p. 114.

rejected as well by Nowack, Driver, Ehrlich, Schulz, McCarter and all modern translations. Stoebe maintains that LXX has followed a different recension, so that the words, while not part of MT's text, were nevertheless already in LXX's Vorlage. It is found in both OL<sup>V</sup> (et iratus factus est iracundia Saul) and OL<sup>S</sup> (et iratus iracundia Saul), and has made its way into a large number of Vg mss as well.<sup>83</sup>

No textual accident can be invoked for an eventual loss from proto-MT, while the plus appears to be an addition according to the sense of the context, showing Saul's increasing frustration at not being able to catch up with David. LXX has supplied what the reader expects in the context, although it is not possible to decide here whether the LXX translators inserted the plus or whether they found it already in its Vorlage.

1 Sam 30:16b-17a

MT: ...ויכנס דוד מהנשף<sup>17</sup> :...ומארץ יהודה<sup>16</sup>

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>16</sup>...και εκ γης Ιουδα. και ηλθεν επ' αυτους Δαυειδ,  
<sup>17</sup>και επαταξεν αυτους απο εωσφορου...

A small plus in LXX tells us that "David went against them", that is, against the Amalekites, before smiting them. Thenius claimed that the words ויבא עליהם fell out of MT through an oversight from הם- to כם-<sup>84</sup> but this neither reproduces the LXX faithfully nor explains why ויבא is missing from MT as well. Budde (SBOT) read with LXX, but then abandoned it in favor of MT (in KHAT), claiming that Judg 8:11 shows that the shorter form is to be preferred. Klostermann reconstructed the text as ויבא עליהם דוד ויך מהנשף, and suggested that the mem was erroneously joined to ויך to give MT ויכנס and LXX αυτους, while then the first clause fell out of MT.<sup>85</sup> He does not say, however, how it could have fallen

83 ΛΗ2ΠΣΒΦΡΕΘΗ2ΑΜ\*G\*P2ΗΚΙ\*ΓΑΒ2ΨΩ.

84 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 122, followed by Peters.

85 Klostermann, p. 124.

out. The other commentators are either silent on the plus or read with MT.

LXX seems here to have filled in a logical step which was left unsaid in MT. It is reported in v.16 that David took the Egyptian who had defected from the Amalekite camp down to where they were feasting off the spoil they had taken. V.17 MT begins, "And David smote them from twilight until the evening of the next day," while LXX apparently found it necessary to specify that David went against the Amalekites. Within the flow of the narrative, however, this small plus is not necessary and appears to show LXX's desire to spell out what MT's more elliptic text leaves up to the reader.

## 2 Sam 8:7

In its plus here, LXX for 2 Sam 8:7 supplies information about the future of the shields which David had taken from Hadadezer's men, telling us that Shishaq, King of Egypt, carried them off with him during his campaign against Jerusalem under Rehoboam. In the passage in 1 Kgs 14:25f. which describes this campaign, the LXX there also contains a plus, which gives the background of these shields, as the following synopsis of these verses shows:

2 Sam 8:7

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX<sup>B</sup></u>	<u>LXX<sup>Ant</sup></u>	<u>4QSam<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>OL<sup>s</sup></u>
הָרִי	και ελαβεν	και ελαβεν	הָרִי	
וְיָד	Δαυειδ	Δαυιδ	וְיָד	
יָשָׁל נָח	τους χλιδωνας	τους χλιδωνας	יָשָׁל נָח	
בְּהִתָּה	τους χρυσους	τους χρυσους	בְּהִתָּה	
וְשָׂא	ους	οι	וְשָׂא	
וְהָיָה	εποιησεν	ησαν	וְהָיָה	
לָכֵן	επι	επι	לָכֵן	
וְכַדִּי	των παιδων των	των παιδων	וְכַדִּי	
וְיָדָה	Αδρααζαρ	Αδρααζαρ του	וְיָדָה	
	βασιλεως Σουβα	βασιλεως Σουβα		
		και παντα τα οπλα		
		τα χρυσα και τα		
		δορατα		
וַיָּבִי	και ηνεγκεν	και ηνεγκεν	וַיָּבִי	
	αυτα	αυτα		
וַיָּרֶשׁ	εις Ιερουσαλημ	εις Ιερουσαλημ	וַיָּרֶשׁ	
	και ελαβεν	και ελαβεν		
	αυτα	αυτα		
	Σουσακειμ	Σουσακειμ		
	βασιλευς	βασιλευς		
	Αιγυπτου	Αιγυπτου		
	εν τω ανα-	εν τω ανα-		
	βηναι αυτον	βηναι αυτον		
	εις Ιερουσαλημ	εις Ιερουσαλημ		
	εν ημεραις	εν ημεραις		
	Ιεροβοαμ	Ροβοαμ		
	υιου	υιου		
	Σολομωντος	Σολομωντος		
				et haec accepit postea Susac rex Aegypti in diebus Roboam filii Salomonis cum ascend- isset in Jerusalem

1 Kgs 14:26

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX<sup>B</sup></u>	<u>LXX<sup>Ant</sup></u>
הָרִי	και ελαβεν	και ελαβεν
הַחֲמִשָּׁה-נָח	παντας τους θησαυρους	παντας τους θησαυρους
בֵּית-יְהוָה	οικου Κυριου	οικου Κυριου
הַחֲמִשָּׁה-נָח	και τους θησαυρους	και τους θησαυρους
בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ	οικου του βασιλεως	οικου του βασιλεως
	και τα δορατα τα	και τα δορατα τα
	χρυσα α ελαβεν	χρυσα α ελαβεν
	Δαυειδ εκ χειρος	Δαυειδ εκ χειρος
	των παιδων Αδρααζαρ	των παιδων Αδρααζαρ
	βασιλεως Σουβα	βασιλεως Σουβα
	και εισηνεγκεν	και εισηνεγκεν
	αυτα εις Ιερουσαλημ	αυτα εις Ιερουσαλημ
וְהָיָה-כֵּן	τα παντα	τα παντα
הָרִי	α ελαβεν	ελαβεν
וְהָיָה-כֵּן	οπλα	και τα οπλα
בְּהִתָּה	τα χρυσα	τα χρυσα
וְשָׂא		α
וְהָיָה		εποιησεν
		Σολομων

Thenius alone suggested that the LXX plus at 2 Sam 8:7 might be original in the text, attributing its loss to an oversight from ירושלם to שלמה.<sup>87</sup> Among the modern translations, NAB alone includes the plus of 8:7 (although not that of 8:8), placing it in brackets in the text. All other commentators are in agreement that the plus material in 2 Sam has come from 1 Kgs 14:25f.,<sup>88</sup> although Ulrich has suggested recently that that theory, on the basis of the presence of the plus in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, should be set aside.<sup>89</sup>

The synoptic presentation of these texts shows that a certain amount of "cross-fertilization" has taken place. Beginning with the LXX plus as 1 Kgs 14:26, although it does not reproduce 2 Sam 8:7 verbatim, it tells us that the golden spears (δοπατα) which Shishaq carried off were those which David had taken from (the hand of >MT) Hadadezer's men. Here 1 Kgs LXX agrees with 2 Sam LXX in including his title as King of Soba. LXX<sup>B</sup> for 1 Kgs, however, has omitted the final phrase of its MT which says that the golden shields had been made by Solomon, which Ant for 1 Kgs retained in its text.

At 2 Sam 8:7, the plus in cod B is found as well in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, Ant, OL<sup>s</sup> and Josephus.<sup>90</sup> Although it gives the same basic information as 1 Kgs 14:25f., the text is quite different and is more a paraphrase than anything else.

Ulrich has shown rightly that the text of OL<sup>s</sup>, beginning with haec in a position of emphasis, implies a Vorlage such as 4Q provides, with נג in the same position.

87 Thenius<sup>2</sup>, p. 181.

88 Peters claimed that it was possible that the plus had fallen out of the text through homeoteleuton, from ירושלם to שלמה, but the presence of the plus in 8:8 as well makes him decide in favor of the plus as an addition (p. 138).

89 QTSJ, p. 47.

90 "These were afterwards taken by the Egyptian King Susakos, who marched against David's grandson Roboam and carried off much other wealth from Jerusalem. But these things we shall narrate when we come to their proper place" (Ant.VII, 105).



4Q's longer text certainly indicates, further, that there existed a Hebrew text containing the plus which constituted the Palestinian text of Samuel (at least in the first century, A.D.). This may be a good indication that the plus was present in LXX's Hebrew Vorlage as well.

LXX for 2 Sam has translated יָבִישׁ as τοὺς χλιδῶνας while in the LXX plus at 1 Kgs we find τὰ δοράτα. In 2 Sam 8:7 LXX has rendered אֶבְיִי as καὶ ἠνεγκεν αὐτὰ and, in its plus, reads καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτὰ even though grammar demands αὐτούς in both places, as they refer to χλιδῶνας. Thus, LXX 2 Sam seems to have been influenced by LXX 1 Kgs in both places, for the double αὐτὰ is otherwise inexplicable. The Ant text of 2 Sam seems to have relieved this grammatical difficulty by adding καὶ πάντα τὰ ὀπλα τὰ χρύσα καὶ τὰ δοράτα, which appears to have been taken from 1 Kgs, for it is found neither in cod B nor in 4Q for 2 Sam and thus may be considered a later addition.<sup>91</sup>

Further, ἐποίησεν in 2 Sam 8:7 for MT הָיָה, and where Ant reads ἦσαν, makes no sense in the context, for David did not make the shields, and may perhaps be explained by ἔσθῃ of 1 Kgs 14:26 even though the subject there is Solomon. So much borrowing seems to have gone on between the two texts that a confused or careless scribe may have had the text of 1 Kgs in his ear, the text which says that Solomon made the shields. הָיָה in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> shows that this text did not undergo the same influence.

A comparison of MT for 2 Sam 8:7 and 1 Kgs 14:25f. shows that these two texts do not refer to the same set of weapons. In 2 Sam David has taken the shields (שָׁלִטִּים) from Hadadezer's men while in 1 Kgs the only shields spoken of are those which Solomon is said to have made (מִגְנִי). It is difficult to see, therefore, how either of the pluses could have been originally in the text. LXX (or, more probably, its

---

91 The parallel to 1 Kgs 14:26 at 2 Chr 12:9 was kept free from all harmonization. For MT אֶת-מִגְנֵי הַזֶּה its LXX text reads τοὺς θυρεοὺς τοὺς χρυσοὺς with no additions at all.

Vorlage) borrowed from each of the places in order to harmonize the readings. The Greek texts of 2 Sam and 1 Kgs have undergone further harmonization by the agreement of *αυτα* in 2 Sam with *δορατα* in 1 Kgs and by the suppression of the mention in 1 Kgs that Solomon made the shields. These two pluses, therefore, witness to the harmonizing literary activity of LXX or its Vorlage.

## 2 Sam 8:8

MT: ומבטח ומכונן ערי יהודה וקרן המלך דוד נחשן רבה מאד

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και εκ της Μασβακ ελαβεν ο βασιλευς Δαυειδ εκ των εκλεκτων πολεων του Αδρααζαρ χαλκον πολυν σφοδρα· εν αυτω εποιησεν Σαλωμων την θαλασσαν την χαλκην και τους στυλους και τους λουτηρας και παντα τα σκευη.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και εκ της Ματεβακ και εκ των εκλεκτων πολεων του Αδρααζαρ ελαβεν ο βασιλευς Δαυιδ χαλκον πολυν σφοδρα· εν αυτω εποιησεν Σολομων την θαλασσαν την χαλκην και τους στυλους και τους λουτηρας και παντα τα σκευη τα χαλκα.

OL<sup>S</sup>: de terra machinas ex electis civitatibus Adadezer regis.... de quo fecit Salomon omnia vasa aerea in templo, et mare aenum, et columnas et altare.

## 1 Chr 18:8

MT: ומבטח ומכונן ערי יהודה וקרן המלך דוד נחשן רבה מאד כה עשן המלך-ים הנחשן ואת-המזבחים ואת כלי הנחשן

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και εκ της Μεταβηκας και εκ των εκλεκτων πολεμων των Αδρααζαρ ελαβεν Δαυειδ χαλκον πολυν σφοδρα· εξ αυτου εποιησεν Σαλωμων την θαλασσαν την χαλκην και τους στυλους και τα σκευη τα χαλκα.

This plus in LXX 2 Sam 8:8 explains that the bronze taken by David from Hadadezer was used by Solomon to make the temple furnishings. As indicated above, the plus is found in OL<sup>S</sup> and appears almost verbatim in 1 Chr 18:8. Although the fragment containing this verse from 4QSam<sup>a</sup> reads only דוד נחשן רבה מאד, and breaks off just before the plus would appear, Ulrich maintains that, since no manuscript which contains the plus at 8:7 lacks that of 8:8, it is likely that 4Q contained it as well.<sup>92</sup>

<sup>92</sup> Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 47. The fragment containing 8:7 has not preserved 8:8 but, as Ulrich notes, "It is plausible, however, that 4Q has the second plus, for no ms which has the first plus lacks the second" (p. 47).

All commentators except Thenius and Klostermann recognize that the plus here was an insertion from 1 Chr 18:8. Whether this took place on the level of the Greek,<sup>93</sup> or was already present in the Hebrew Vorlage, as Peters suggested,<sup>94</sup> and as Ulrich claims because of its presence in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, it seems clear that direct borrowing has taken place. Klostermann hesitated in accepting this plus as a later insertion on the grounds that καὶ τοὺς λουτήρας in LXX Sam, absent from Chr, shows that the text was not taken from Chr.<sup>95</sup> We may see in the mention of the basins, however, an example of the initiative of an editor of Sam who, knowing of the bronze basins from 1 Kgs 7:30 and 2 Chr 4:6.14, as well as the bronze basins in the Tent of Meeting (Ex 30:18.28; 31:9; 38:8; 40:30; Lev 8:11; Num 4:14), had no difficulty in inserting what he felt to be a lack in the text of Chr. The text of Ant for Sam completes what may have been an oversight in Greek by adding the final τὰ χαλκὰ as found in Chr.

In the text of OL<sup>s</sup>, the final item mentioned, et altare, corresponds neither to Sam nor to Chr, and the translator seems to have taken the same liberty as LXX Sam in adjusting the text to his own interests.

This plus shows the Chronicler's interest in things pertaining to the temple,<sup>96</sup> which is not particularly evidenced in MT Sam, but which accounts for the harmonization by a later editor, either in its Vorlage or in the Greek translation. As for 8:7, the shorter MT is to be preferred as the more original text, into which the historical note on the destiny of David's bronze was inserted.

---

93 Cf. Smith and Budde.

94 Peters, p. 139.

95 Klostermann, p. 166.

96 Cf. Smith, p. 307; Martin Rehm, Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik (Münster, 1937), p. 25.

2 Sam 11:22

MT:                   כִּי יָבִיֵא אֶת-הַיָּדָאֵל לְדָוִד וְיֹאמַר כִּי יָבִיֵא אֶת-הַיָּדָאֵל לְדָוִד

LXX<sup>B</sup>:   και επορευθη ο αγγελος Ιωαβ προς τον βασιλεα εις Ιερουσαλημ, και παρεγενετο και απηγγειλεν τω Δαυειδ παντα οσα απηγγειλεν αυτω Ιωαβ, παντα τα ρηματα του πολему. και εθυμωθη Δαυειδ προς Ιωαβ, και ειπεν προς τον αγγελον Ινα τι προσηγαγετε προς την πολιν του πολемуσαι; ουκ ηδειτε οτι πληγησεσθε απο του τειχους; τις επαταξεν τον Αβειμελεχ υιον Ιεροβοαμ; ουχι γυνη ερριψεν επ' αυτον κλασμα μυλου απο του τειχους και απεθανεν εν θαμασι; ινα τι προσηγαγετε προς το τειχος;

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και παρεγενετο ο αγγελος Ιωαβ προς τον βασιλεα εις Ιερουσαλημ, και απηγγειλεν τω Δαυιδ παντα τα ρηματα του πολему, και εθυμωθη οργη Δαυιδ επι Ιωαβ, και ειπεν προς τον αγγελον Ινα τι προσηλθετε προς την πολιν του πολемуσαι; ουκ ηδειτε οτι πληγησεσθε απο του τειχους; τις επαταξεν τον Αβιμελεχ υιον Ιεροβοαλ; ουχι γυνη ερριψεν επ' αυτον κλασμα μυλου απο του τειχους, και απεθανεν εν θαμεσσει; ινα τι προσηγαγετε προς το τειχος;

A large plus at 2 Sam 11:22, which describes Joab's report to David that Uriah had been eliminated during a battle with the Ammonites, has led most commentators to correct the text in varying degrees according to the Greek text.<sup>97</sup> Joab's prediction to the messenger, in vv.20f., that David will get angry at the news of the loss of some of his soldiers and will evoke the case of Abimelech's death at the wall, is fulfilled by the plus in LXX v.22 although completely absent from MT. Thenius noted that the כִּי in v.23 with which the messenger begins his report indicates that something is missing from the text. He suggested that the text of v.22 originally read as LXX<sup>B</sup>, but that the sentence אֶת-הַיָּדָאֵל...וְיֹאמַר fell out because of the great similarity between its final word and מָלַח (from the phrase παντα τα ρηματα του πολему) which originally preceded it. Then for some unknown reason ("aus unbekannter Veranlassung"), the phrase אֶת-הַיָּדָאֵל...וְיֹאמַר itself was

97 Keil, Erdmann, Hummelauer, Barthélemy, RSV, NAB (with a note to say that the Greek text is, in fact older), TOB, Eü, HOTTP, BHS read with MT but all others suggest at least some correction in the text.

overlooked and disappeared from the text, to produce the present corrupt MT.<sup>98</sup> When Böttcher criticized his explanation, Thenius refined it in his second edition, saying that the entire section *אל-החומה ויחר...* is indeed to be restored to v.22 according to LXX, but that v.21 up to *אל-החומה* is to be omitted, a scribe's eye having wandered down to v.22 and erroneously put these words in v.21 after the *מעל החומה* which was too similar. The scribe then, realizing his error, simply continued on in v.21 with *ואמר* and then purposely left David's speech in v.22 out.<sup>99</sup>

Böttcher's own explanation was that the LXX form of v.22 was the original one but that everything between *εθυσθη* and *προς το ταχυς* was lost through homeoteleuton. This sentence was then later re-introduced into the text but in the wrong place, in v.20f. The words of LXX v.22, *אח-כל-דברי המלחמה* "must have stood after *יואב* in MT a long time, but then later were taken out since it seemed unnecessary in the light of v.19." Then a later reader included the now erroneous vv.20f. in the Greek translation.<sup>100</sup> Thus, according to Böttcher and Thenius<sup>2</sup>, in the original text of 2 Sam 11:19ff, the reference to Abimelech's death under the wall was evoked not by Joab in his instructions to the messenger, but by David upon hearing the report of the battle.<sup>101</sup>

Wellhausen, while noting Thenius' ingenious explanation for the missing text in MT, is content to say simply that MT purposely shortened the text since it was felt that *ויגר לדור אח כל-אשר שלחו יואב* was sufficient.<sup>102</sup>

98 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 176. The *כי* in v.23 does not necessarily imply a reponse to a question by David, but may be taken as a subordinating conjunction introducing the direct object after a verbum dicendi (cf. Joüon 157c; Gesenius-Kautzsch 157b).

99 Thenius<sup>2</sup>, p. 195.

100 Böttcher, p. 168.

101 This is, in fact, Josephus' order of the account (Ant. VII, 141f.), and has been followed by Budde and Hertzberg.

102 Wellhausen, p. 182, followed by Smith, Löhr, Peters and Nowack.

Many commentators have restored the text according to LXX<sup>B</sup>, so that the story of Abimelech occurs in vv.20b-21 and in v.22.<sup>103</sup> Klostermann is the only one to suggest reading the entire text according to Ant, which contains not only the plus of cod B, but also anticipates, in v.21, the messenger's description of the battle as found in MT and LXX<sup>B</sup> v.24, as well as including the mention that eighteen men were killed.<sup>104</sup> Dhorme includes the eighteen men in v.24 (found only in Ant), but neglects to mention the long Ant plus at v.21.<sup>105</sup>

In order to unravel the difficulties here it is necessary first of all to examine the various forms of the Greek text. 2 Sam 11 occurs in the section designated as βγ' and therefore, cod B here contains the kaigé recension<sup>106</sup> while the text of Ant that of OG, even though most commentators have corrected the text according to cod B.

In v.19 for מלחמה כל-לכודי אק cod B reads παντας τους λογους του πολему, and Ant παντα τα ρηματα του πολему. Further on, in the plus in v.22, both B and Ant agree on παντα τα ρηματα του πολему.

In v.20 for ירי cod B has τοξευσουσιν and Ant πληγησεσθε while in the plus at v.22 both agree on πληγησεσθε. Later on, in v.24, for יריו, cod B has ετοξευσαν, and Ant κατεβαρυνθη (as well as in its plus in v.21). From Thenius on, most commentators correct v.20 ירי to יכו, but, while the presence of πληγησεσθε in Ant and in the plus of cod B at v.22 confirms that it was the original Greek reading, there is nothing to indicate that it was the more authentic Hebrew, nor does it yield a superior meaning.

---

103 Thus Driver, Schulz, Kittel, BJ, Osty, Dhorme (1956), NEB.

104 Klostermann, p. 177.

105 Dhorme (1910), pp. 356ff.

106 Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila.

For  $\lambda\gamma\eta$ , v.20, cod B has  $\alpha\pi\alpha\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$  and Ant  $\alpha\pi\omicron$ . In v.21, for MT  $\lambda\gamma\eta$ , cod B has  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$  while Ant again has  $\alpha\pi\omicron$ . In the plus in v.22, cod B and Ant agree on  $\alpha\pi\omicron$ , and in v.24, for  $\lambda\gamma\eta$ , cod B once again has  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$  for Ant  $\alpha\pi\omicron$ . Barthélemy has shown that  $\alpha\pi\omicron$  or  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\nu\omega$  for the compound preposition  $\lambda\gamma\eta$  is standard for OG, while  $\alpha\pi\alpha\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu/\epsilon\pi\alpha\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$  is a characteristic of the kaigé recension,  $\alpha\pi\omicron$  occurring in kaigé only where there was no Hebrew base to correct to.<sup>107</sup>

In v.21, MT  $\eta\pi\omega\gamma$  becomes  $\text{Ιεροβοαμ}$  in B and  $\text{Ιεροβοαλ}$  in Ant.<sup>108</sup> Cod B, against both MT and Ant, then adds  $\upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon \text{ Νηρ}$ .

At this point in v.21, after  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , and therefore forming part of the message that is supposed to be delivered to David, Ant adds  $\sigma\tau\iota \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu \omicron\iota \alpha\upsilon\delta\rho\epsilon\varsigma \epsilon\phi' \eta\mu\alpha\varsigma, \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\chi\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu \epsilon\phi' \eta\mu\alpha\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron \pi\epsilon\delta\iota\omicron\nu, \kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\lambda\alpha\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \epsilon\omega\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \pi\upsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma, \kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\beta\alpha\rho\upsilon\nu\theta\eta \tau\alpha \beta\epsilon\lambda\eta \epsilon\pi\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \sigma\omicron\upsilon \alpha\pi\omicron \tau\epsilon\iota\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma, \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\pi\epsilon\theta\alpha\nu\omicron\nu \alpha\pi\omicron \tau\omega\nu \delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omega\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma \omega\sigma\epsilon\iota \alpha\upsilon\delta\rho\epsilon\varsigma \delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha \omicron\kappa\tau\omega$ , which anticipates the Ant form of the messenger's account of the battle as told in v.24. That this was not incorporated into the kaigé recension is a good sign that it indicates even later recensional activity. It could have been omitted by kaigé on the grounds that it was not found in MT, but the presence of the plus in v.22 shows that kaigé was willing to preserve the longer Greek text even where it found no Hebrew base.

Still in v.21,  $\kappa\alpha\iota \gamma\epsilon$  for  $\omicron\lambda$  (and for  $\omicron\lambda\iota$  in v.24) is the sign of the recension by that name in cod B, whereas Ant has  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  in both places. Finally in v.21, cod B  $\alpha\pi\epsilon\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\nu$  versus Ant  $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$  for  $\eta\eta$  appears again for the same verb in v.24.

In v.22, aside from the large plus in all Greek texts which describes David's anger, MT, cod B and Ant each contain a different reading:

107 Barthélemy, Les Devanciers, pp. 55ff.

108 Thus Lagarde. Only ms o has  $\text{Ιεροβοαλ}$  here, while b has  $\text{Ιεροβοαμ}$ ,  $c_2$   $\text{Ιεροβααλ}$  and  $e_2$   $\text{Ιεροβαλ}$ . In the plus of v.22 mss b  $\delta$  have  $\text{Ιεροβοαλ}$ , and b'  $c_2$   $e_2$   $\text{Ιεροβααλ}$  for cod B  $\text{Ιεροβοαμ}$ . OL<sup>v</sup> here reads  $\text{Ιεροβοαμ}$ , the only instance in this verse where OL<sup>v</sup> agree with B against Ant.

MT: ...גדל ויבא לאחרי ילדיו

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και επορευθη ο αγγελος Ιωαβ προς τον βασιλεα εις Ιερουσαλημ και παραγενετο, και απηγγειλεν...

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και παρεγενετο ο αγγελος Ιωαβ προς τον βασιλεα εις Ιερουσαλημ και απηγγειλεν...

Schulz recommended the restoration of *גדל-אכא יבא לאחרי ילדיו* ...גדל ויבא, blaming the absence in MT on parablepsis between *אכא* and *יבא* with the compensating addition of the article with *לאחרי* after the rest of the sentence had fallen out.<sup>109</sup> This is not possible, however, if Ant is seen to represent OG since that text does not contain *παρεγενετο* in the place which corresponds to MT *ויבא*. Klostermann, Budde and Nowack, even though they follow LXX in the main for these verses, explicitly reject the originality of this longer form of v.22a as being a LXX expansion.<sup>110</sup> Since these extra words in Greek could not have fallen out through a simple textual accident, we may accept MT as the more original form, and see in the plus LXX's own expansionist activity. This, of course, also increases the likelihood that the rest of the plus in v.22 is an expansion as well.

In v.24, *וַיָּבֹא* appears three times in MT. In cod B the first two are translated *παῖς* while the third is *δουλος*. Ant has *δουλος* for all three.<sup>111</sup>

109 Schulz II, p. 121. Cf. also, Thenius, Peters, Dhorme and Smith.

110 Klostermann called it a "blosse Verbreitung in exegetischer Absicht" (p. 177); Budde, "überflüssig" (KHAT, p. 258), and Nowack, "eine erklärende Weiterung" (p. 193).

111 The evidence for modification of *δουλος* to *παῖς* in the *kaigé* recension is present but sporadic, as the following figures show: *παῖς* in B = *δουλος* in b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>: α) 0/22; ββ) 3/16 [2 Sam 10:2.3.4]; βγ) 7/28 [2 Sam 11:24.24; 14:30.30.31; 15:14; 19:19]; γγ) 0/17; γδ) 3/19 [2 Kgs 5:26.26; 10:5]. On the other hand, again for MT *וַיָּבֹא*, *δουλος* in B = *παῖς* in b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>: α) 0/36; ββ) 0/26; βγ) 9/44 [2 Sam 11:9.11; 12:18; 18:29; 19:5.7.14.26; 21:22]; γγ) 0/44; γδ) 3/42 [2 Kgs 14:5; 21:8.10]. These figures show that the variation is hardly systematic, but when it does occur, it occurs in the sections βγ and γδ only (with the exception of three instances in 2 Sam 10, which may have come under *kaigé* influence; cf. James D. Shenkel, "A Comparative Study of the Synoptic Parallels in I Paraleipomena and I-II Reigns," HTR 62 (1969), pp. 63-85).



The result of these observations is that, where there is a Hebrew base in MT, cod B is closer to it than to Ant. Where no Hebrew text is present, cod B follows Ant, with the exception of Ant's plus at v.21. We may conclude, therefore, that Ant gives us the more original Greek text, except for its plus in v.21. Whether the Greek text represents a Vorlage that was different from MT, or whether the text was modified by OG itself is difficult to decide for these verses.

Considering the totality of the plus in v.22, LXX seems to have expanded its text in order to bring about the angry reaction on David's part which Joab predicted. It is hardly likely that Joab could have predicted that David, in his anger, would allude to Abimelech's death and that thus the speech would be repeated. Those who suggest a displacement of the verses (cf. Thenius and Böttcher), and place the speech in David's mouth alone, have a point as far as the logic of the narrative is concerned, but in the overall narrative this would seem to be excluded by the fact that David does not know that the battle took place under the wall until v.24. Joab had predicted that the account of the battle would cause David to get angry, but that the news of Uriah's death would appease him. The messenger was intelligent enough to know how to avoid David's anger by getting right down to the information that he wanted, that Uriah had been killed.<sup>112</sup> LXX, unsatisfied that Joab's prediction of David's anger did not come to pass, and not having understood the cleverness of the messenger, added the plus to v.22 so that Joab's words were fulfilled. Once again, therefore, LXX witnesses to a text into which an insertion has been made, whose form indicates that it could not have fallen out of proto-MT through a textual accident, in order to provide what it felt necessary for the smooth flowing of the narrative.

---

112 Cf. Keil, who noted, "The messenger informed David of everything, as Joab had instructed him, but cutting it short in such a way that he also mentioned Uriah's death" (p. 280). On the messenger's cleverness in doing so, cf. Barthélemy, CTAT.

2 Sam 14:27

MT: ויולדו לאבשלום שלושה בנים ובת אחת ושמה תמר היא היתה  
אשה יפת מראה

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ετεχθησαν τω Αβεσσαλωμ τρεις υιοι και θυγατηρ μια,  
και ονομα αυτη θημαρ· αυτη ην γυνη καλη σφοδρα, και  
γινεται γυνη τω Ροβοαμ υιω Σαλωμων και τικτει αυτω  
τον Αβιαθαρ.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ετεχθησαν τω Αβεσσαλωμ τρεις υιοι και θυγατηρ μια,  
και το ονομα αυτης Μααχα. και αυτη η γυνη καλη σφοδρα,  
και γινεται γυνη τω Ροβοαμ υιω Σολομωντος, και τικτει  
αυτω τον Αβια.

OL<sup>V</sup>: ...nomen erat ei Moacha et haec puella erat bona  
specie valde; et fuit mulier in matrimonium Roboam  
filio Salamonis, et peperit ei Abiam.

4QSam<sup>C</sup>: [ויולדו לאבשלום שלושה בנים ובת]  
[א]חת [ו]שמה תמר והיא היתה [אשה יפת מראה מאודה]

In spite of 2 Sam 18:18, where it is reported that Absalom had no son, our text here attributes three unnamed sons<sup>113</sup> and a daughter to him. In MT, cod B,<sup>114</sup> Vg, Tg and Syr, the daughter's name is Thamar while in Ant and OL<sup>V</sup> she is called Maacha. Further, the entire Greek text tradition and OL give the additional information that she became the wife of Rehoboam, son of Solomon, and bore him a son, Abiathar in codd B a<sub>2</sub> and Abia in the rest of the mss and OL.

Thenius called the plus a "very old Hebrew gloss,"<sup>115</sup> and Klostermann maintained that it was probably original in the text, as was the name Maacha, but was removed when the name was changed to Thamar.<sup>116</sup> All other commentators consider the plus an addition to the text.

113 Thenius<sup>2</sup> (p. 214) suggested that the fact that they are unnamed may indicate that they died very young, which would explain 2 Sam 18:18.

114 Along with mss A c d e f m p q s t w x a<sub>2</sub> and Brooke-McLean's OL<sup>h</sup> (Vienna fragments of OL according to the edition of M. Haupt [Vienna, 1877]).

115 Thenius<sup>2</sup>, p. 215.

116 Klostermann, p. 195.

In 1 Kgs 15:2 we read that Abijam's mother was Maacha, the daughter of Absalom. At 2 Chr 11:20, Rehoboam took Maacha, daughter of Absalom, as his wife whose firstborn son was Abijah, although 2 Chr 13:2, the parallel to 1 Kgs 15:2, relates that Abijah's mother, Micaiah, was the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah. Further, 2 Sam 3:3 tells us that Absalom's mother was Maacha, daughter of Talmai. This gives the following genealogy:

David   ┌ Maacha (2 Sam 3:3)  
         └ Absalom   ┌ ?  
                     └ (Thamar) Maacha   ┌ Rehoboam  
                                     └ Abijah/m = Maacha (1 Kgs 15:2)

Thus we have three Maacha's spread out over four generations. Pre-MT may have mistakenly put Thamar in 14:27, confusing the girl's name with that of Absalom's sister. OG, or its Vorlage, corrected the text on the basis of 1 Kgs 15:2 and then added the plus, again based on 15:2. in order to confirm the modification and clear up the confusion. Thamar is thus probably the earliest, if erroneous, reading in proto-MT, for if Maacha had been in the text originally, it is not likely that it would have been modified to Thamar in the face of so many texts which give the contrary. The kaigé recension, faced with the contradictory readings, must have deliberately changed its Greek text in order to read Thamar in conformity with MT, but further confused her identity by preserving the now contradictory LXX plus.

The text of 4QSam<sup>c</sup>, according to Ulrich's reconstruction, follows MT's shorter text, along with the name of Absalom's daughter as Thamar.<sup>117</sup>

Josephus relates that "Thamara", daughter of Absalom, married Rehoboam,<sup>118</sup> and later, that Jeroboam took

117 Cf. Ulrich, "4QSam<sup>c</sup>: A Fragmentary Manuscript...", p. 170. Ulrich makes no mention anywhere in this article of the agreement between MT and 4QSam<sup>c</sup> on this shorter reading against the LXX plus.

118 Ant. VII, 244.

"Machane" as his second wife, "whose mother was Absalom's daughter Thamara."<sup>119</sup>

On the basis of the contradictory evidence, in which MT, 4QSam<sup>c</sup>, LXX<sup>B</sup>, and Josephus read Tamar, while Ant (OG), OL<sup>v</sup>, and the tradition in both Kgs and Chr read Maacha, it is probably not possible to determine what the daughter's name actually was. What seems clear, however, is that at 2 Sam 14:27 LXX or its Vorlage has modified the name of Absalom's daughter and added the information from 1 Kgs 15:2, most likely in order to make the text of Sam agree with that of Kgs and thus harmonize the narrative.

#### 2 Sam 19:11b.12b

- MT: וַתָּחֵן לְמָה אַתָּה מַחְשִׁים לַהֲשִׁיב אֶת-הַמֶּלֶךְ...<sup>12aβb</sup> לְמָה תִּהְיוּ אַחֲרָיִם לַהֲשִׁיב אֶת-הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל-בֵּיתוֹ וּדְבַר כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל בָּא אֶל-הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל-בֵּיתוֹ
- LXX<sup>B</sup>: 11b και νυν, ινα τι υμεις κωφευετε του επιστρεφαι προς τον βασιλεα; και το ρημα παντος Ισραηλ ηλθεν προς τον βασιλεα...<sup>12aβb</sup> ινα τι γινεσθε εσχατοι του επιστρεφαι προς τον βασιλεα εις τον οικον αυτου; και λογος παντος Ισραηλ ηλθεν προς τον βασιλεα.
- LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: 11b και νυν ινα τι σιωπατε υμεις επιστρεφαι (προς<sup>120</sup>) τον βασιλεα; και το ρημα παντος Ισραηλ ηλθεν προς τον βασιλεα...<sup>12aβb</sup> ινα τι γινεσθε εις εσχατους του επιστρεφαι τον βασιλεα εις τον οικον αυτου;  
13b και λογος παντος Ισραηλ ηλθεν προς τον βασιλεα.

In these verses which describe the Israelites' decision to return to David's authority and David's invitation to the Judaeans to do the same, an entire sentence is located differently in MT and LXX. The first part of MT 12b, "And the word of all Israel came to the king," appears twice in LXX: at the end of vv.11 and 12 in cod B,<sup>121</sup> and at the end of vv.11 and 13 in Ant. The end of MT v.12, "to his house", is missing from LXX here and is found in both B and Ant at the end of v.13 (where it is absent from MT).

<sup>119</sup> Ant. VII, 249.

<sup>120</sup> Ppos was omitted by Lagarde and is absent from ms o, but present in mss b c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> as well as in B A g z a<sub>2</sub>.

<sup>121</sup> I have followed the Hebrew text's numbering system for LXX as well throughout the discussion of this verse in order to avoid confusion.

Most commentators follow LXX here and place the dislocated sentence after v.11,<sup>122</sup> which Wellhausen identified as the original Greek location by the use of  $\rho\eta\mu\alpha$  where cod B in v.12, and Ant in v.12, have  $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ .<sup>123</sup> In such a position, the sentence introduces v.12, as it relates that the deliberations of the Israelites were made known to David, which then inspires him to invite the Judaeans not to be the last to accept him as king.

Keil objected to transferring the half-verse on the grounds that in such a position, v.12 should begin with  $\text{וַיִּשְׁלַח הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד}$ .<sup>124</sup> At the end of v.12, as MT reads, the clause forms part of David's argumentation to be presented to the Judaeans: Why are you, Judaeans, the last to bring back the king? The Israelites have made known to the king their desire to return under his authority.<sup>125</sup>

That this text was problematic early on is shown by the versions, for, while Vg and Tg follow MT, OL<sup>s</sup> reads with LXX for v.11: Et consilium totius Israel venit ad regem, and at the end of v.12 reads ...pervenerunt ad regem, ut reducerent eum in domum suam, quia dixerat rex: Haec dicitis ad populum, which provides a transition to v.13.

Syr, on the other hand, adds at the end of v.11, in the mouths of the Israelites, "Come, let us bring him (the king) back to his house" (tw nhpkywhw lbytw), followed by "and the word of all the Israelites went in to the king. And the king said to them, 'You are my brothers and my flesh and bone etc.,'" Thus Syr has either suffered a haplography, which eliminated "And King David sent to Zadok and Abiathar the priests, 'Say to the elders of Israel: Why should you be the

---

122 Houbigant, Thenius, Böttcher, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Nowack, Budde, Driver, Smith, Dhorme, Peters, Kittel, Hertzberg, NEB, NAB, BJ, Osty, Eü, Barthélemy (Les Devanciers, p. 122).

123 Wellhausen, p. 204.

124 Keil, followed by Ehrlich and Schulz.

last to bring the king back to his house?'" ,<sup>126</sup> or else the material was deliberately suppressed because of its repetitiveness.

Ulrich has shown that the displaced clause was present in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in the same position as in LXX, at the end of v.11.<sup>127</sup> Since the argument is based on space considerations within a fragment and the text is not attested to directly, it is impossible to know if the final words of MT, וְכָל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, were present in 4Q or not, although the spacing seems to indicate that they were not.

When Thenius first suggested reading with LXX on the position of MT v.12b, he originally proposed the cod B form, i.e., reading the clause both at the end of v.11 and of v.12.<sup>128</sup> He abandoned this, however, and it seems clear that a choice must be made. As it stands in LXX, it serves to form the transition between the Israelites' deliberations and David's message to the Judaeans.<sup>129</sup> If, on the other hand, it forms a part of David's message to the Judaeans, as in MT, it provides a way of forcing their hand in re-accepting him as a king. If its original position was at the end of v.11, it does not seem possible that it would have been deliberately relocated to v.12, whereas it is not impossible that LXX could have misunderstood the flow of narrative and changed its position since, if it occurs at the end of v.12 it is certainly the lectio difficilior. Here, however, if

---

125 Thus Keil, Erdmann, Löhr, Ehrlich, Schulz, RSV, TOB, BHS, HOTTP.

126 Restored in one Syr ms, Codex Leningradensis Bibl. Publ. N S n. 2 (5th cent.), along with "and the word of all Israel came to the king", as in MT (cf. The Old Testament in Syriac II,2, ad loc.).

127 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 89.

128 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 217.

129 Although rejected by Barthélemy as "prosaic" in CTAT.

its original place was in v.11, the possibility that it was accidentally dislocated must not be excluded since the word המלך occurs no less than five times in vv.11-13, and is followed by אל-ביתו in vv.12 and 13. The occurrence of אל-ביתו at the end of MT v.12 seems to be the sign that a corruption has taken place in its text. The original Hebrew text, following LXX Ant for vv.11f. would have read:

... להשיב את-המלך. ודבר כל-ישראל בא אל-  
 המלך.<sup>12</sup> והמלך דוד שלח ... להשיב את-המלך  
 אל-ביתו.<sup>13</sup> אחי אתם...

A scribe's eye wandering from אח המלך to the המלך which begins v.12 would have eliminated everything in between. When its absence was missed, it was inserted after the את-המלך of v.12 instead of that of v.11, which would account for the אל-ביתו at the end of the present MT v.12 which makes no sense in the context. אל-ביתו was then added again after את-המלך in its rightful place, without, however, removing it from its erroneous position after אל-המלך in MT v.12. That even cod B, here the kaigé text which has been corrected according to MT, does not include the phrase either at the end of v.11, where it follows LXX, or at the end of v.12 where it follows MT otherwise, shows either that it recognized the alien nature of the words at the end of v.12, or that the phrase crept into MT at a later date. The fact the Tg here follows MT literally, including the erroneous אל-ביתו, may be a sign that it was on kaigé's own initiative that it omitted the misplaced phrase. Later on, at the end of v.13, MT reads simply המלך את-המלך להשיב while LXX adds εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. Here, however, it is not possible to decide if MT is again at fault or if LXX has harmonized its reading.

If we take LXX to be the original position of the notice that the word of Israel come to the king, this reduces the content of David's message to the Judaeans, but the context of the narrative seems to require that David somehow be apprised of what the Israelite tribes had been discussing. In its LXX position, the phrase ידבר כל-ישראל is a clear reference to their decision to bring back the king. If it forms part of David's message to the Judaeans, as MT would have it, it seems far too vague for them to know what the

content of this דבר might be.

We may see in these verses, therefore, an accidental dislocation of an entire clause in MT whose original position was maintained in LXX. The kaigé recension both maintained the LXX form as it found it and added the clause at the end of v.12 as well. That these verses have been a source of confusion is further shown by the variants in OL and Syr, as well as by the fact that Ant repeats the misplaced clause again at the end of v.13. In this case, however, we read with the texts shared by LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

## 2 Sam 24:15

MT: ויתן יהוה דבר בישראל מהבקר ועד-עת מועד וימת מן-העם  
 מִדָּן וְעַד-בָּאָר שֶׁבַע שָׁבָעִים אֲלָף אִישׁ

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και εξελεξατο εαυτω Δαυειδ τον θανατον· και ημεραι  
 θερισμου πυρων, και εδωκεν Κυριος εν Ισραηλ θανατον  
 απο πρωιθεν εως ωρας αριστου· και ηρξατο η θραυσις  
 εν τω λαω, και απεθανεν εκ του λαου απο Δαν και εως  
 Βηρσαββε, εβδομηκοντα χιλιαδες ανδρων.

## 1 Chr 21:14

MT: ויתן יהוה דבר בישראל ויפל מישראל שבעים אלא איש

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και εδωκεν Κυριος θανατον εν Ισραηλ, και επεσον εξ  
 Ισραηλ εβδομηκοντα χιλιαδες ανδρων.

In these pluses in LXX for 24:15, where there is essentially no difference between cod B and Ant, David is said to choose the plague from among the possibilities offered him by the Lord, the season is specified as the time of the wheat harvest, and explicit mention is made that the plague began among the people. The majority of commentators has either inserted the LXX pluses as part of the original text,<sup>130</sup> or else replaced MT, which would have come from the parallel in 1 Chr 21:14, with LXX.<sup>131</sup> Most have followed Wellhausen's

130 Thenius, Graetz, Budde, Kittel, BJ, Osty (who eliminates "and the plague began among the people", but otherwise follows LXX).

131 Wellhausen, Klostermann, Smith, Driver, Peters, Nowack, Dhorme (1910; in 1956 he retained "and David chose the plague", but otherwise followed MT), NAB.



lead in rejecting MT as a colorless insertion from 1 Chr in favor of LXX's more specific and dramatic account. Those who read with MT, on the other hand, point out that David's choice is sufficiently clear in MT without the need to specify, as does LXX; that no reason is given how MT could have come about if LXX were original here; and that the mention of the harvest time was an insertion in order to prepare the way for the episode of Araunah and the threshing floor in 24:16ff.<sup>132</sup> Barthélemy, in rejecting the plus, stresses the fact that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> for 24:20<sup>133</sup> along with 1 Chr 21:20 mention that Araunah was threshing wheat when David came to him. That the reference to the harvested wheat should appear in different places in LXX Sam, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and 1 Chr shows the secondary character of the reading as an insertion.<sup>134</sup>

The suggested retroversions for *καὶ ἐξελεξάτο αὐτῷ Δαυεὶδ τὸν θάνατον*, and *καὶ ἤρξατο ἡ θραυσίς ἐν τῷ λαῷ* have provided no problem: *וַיִּבְחַר לוֹ דָּוִד תָּא-הַדָּבָר*, and *וַיַּחֲלֵל הַמִּגְפָּה בָּעַם*, and *וַיִּמֵּי* respectively. *Καὶ ἡμέραι θέρους πύρων*, however, is problematic. Thenius suggested, for *καὶ ἡμέραι*, *וַיִּמֵּי*,<sup>135</sup> which was later modified to *וַיִּמֵּי וְהַיָּמִים* by Driver.<sup>136</sup> The phrase *καὶ ἡμέραι θέρους πύρων* by itself, however, cannot express a time within which something took place, nor has any attempt been made to ameliorate it in any Greek ms beyond the addition of the article *αἱ*.<sup>137</sup> Klostermann alone suggested *וַיִּמֵּי*,<sup>138</sup> but was followed by no one. Nowhere else in Hebrew does *וַיִּמֵּי* or *וַיִּמֵּי* occur without preposition to indicate the time at which something took place. At Gen 30:14 and Judg 15:1 we

132 Keil, Erdmann, Löhr, Hummelauer, Ehrlich, Schulz, Rehm, Hertzberg, RSV, NEB, TOB, BHS, HOTTP.

133 Cf. Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 158.

134 Barthélemy, CTAT.

135 Thenius<sup>2</sup>, p. 290.

136 Driver<sup>1</sup> (1890), p. 287.

137 Added by M a d e f g h i j l m n p q s t w y z b<sub>2</sub>.

138 Klostermann, p. 258.

read בנימי קציר בראשונים and 2 Sam 21:9 בנימי קציר חטים. The phrase בנימי קציר כל at Josh 3:15 seems disqualified as an example because of its use with כל. Turning to Driver's suggestion, we find בנימי קציר בנימי קציר at Num 13:20, where LXX has translated as και αι ημεραι ημεραι εαρος προσδρομοι σταφυλης, whose time indication is perfectly clear in both Hebrew and Greek. There is, however, no evidence of a second ημεραι in 2 Sam 24:15 to justify בנימי קציר. OL<sup>V</sup> here has translated according to the sense: Et erat tempus messium frumenti, but this does not presume a different Greek text than that of LXX. If the plus were a Greek addition, we should presume that it would have been grammatically correct, and thus, it appears that this plus goes back to a Hebrew Vorlage which was problematic in itself but from which LXX slavishly translated.

As to the more original reading for this verse, we must either accept MT's shorter text, the longer, combined form as found in LXX, or, following Wellhausen, the OG form.

Wellhausen based his suggestion that MT is a later text on the observation that בנימי קציר-ועד מועד anticipates the later developments in the narrative, and thus, και εδωκεν ... ωρας αριστου had been added to the original LXX which read και εξελεξατο ... εν τω λαω, and which was based on a Hebrew Vorlage. The fact that בנימי קציר-ועד מועד is absent from Chr was a further indication for him that it was not original.<sup>139</sup>

Wellhausen's observation is valid up to the point that we are dealing with two different, and originally separate, texts here. The phrase in LXX, "And the plague began among the people," following as it does upon MT's "And the Lord sent a plague in Israel from the morning to the appointed time," appears to be superfluous. If we put the LXX pluses side by side, however, they form a perfectly coherent sequence, albeit parallel to and not compatible with that of MT. An indication of which of these is more original is found, however, in different points of view expressed. MT reads "And the Lord sent a plague...", while LXX tells us, "And David

<sup>139</sup> Wellhausen, pp. 219ff.

chose the plague ...". David's cry in v.14, "Let us fall into the hands of the Lord, for his mercy is great," appears, on first sight, to exclude only the second of the three choices, that of pursuit by David's enemies. More profoundly, however, David's response may be seen as a refusal to choose any one of the proposed punishments, and shows his desire to throw himself on God's mercy.<sup>140</sup> In MT v.15, the Lord himself takes the initiative in sending the plague, whereas in LXX it is David's own choice. It is less likely that, if LXX's form were the more original, it would have been changed later to give the initiative to the Lord. MT's form seems to respect David's desire in v.14 to leave the choice up to him. It appears, therefore, that we have two separate traditions dealing with the coming of the plague upon the people, and MT's tradition both respects the context more closely and constitutes a sign of being the earlier of the two in giving the initiative to the Lord rather than to David himself.

The translation of *וַעַר-עַת מוֹעַד* in LXX by *εως ωρας απιστου* indicates that the Vorlage of LXX already knew of a Hebrew text at least similar to that of MT. The word *απιστου* in LXX is a translation of *לֹאס* in 1 Kgs 5:2, but where it appears elsewhere it has no Hebrew base (Tob 2:1.4; Bel and the Dragon 34:37; Susanna 13). The verb *απισταν* translates *לֹאס יאכלו* at Gen 43:25, appears without a Hebrew base at 1 Sam 14:24 and Tob 2:1 [S], and translates *וַסַּר* at 1 Kgs 13:7. This last occurrence shows that LXX apparently read *סַר* for *מוֹעַד*, either accidentally or deliberately, at 2 Sam 24:15.<sup>141</sup>

140 Cf. Hertzberg (p. 413), "As the text now stands, it is the Lord who determines the duration of the punishment, just as it was he who appointed its character."

141 Cf. also, the treatise Yoma 75b in the Babylonian Talmud, where *סַר* is used to indicate the meal given by Moses at Ex 16:8, as well as at Num 11:33, when, while the Israelites were eating, the Lord smote them with a plague. The text of Syr for 2 Sam 24:15 seems to have been influenced by LXX as it translates, "from the morning to the sixth hour."

Wellhausen objected to MT here since it took away the tension in anticipating later developments, but, as the text stands in LXX, which specifies that the plague lasted "until dinner-time", this more specific indication of its duration, based on an apparent misreading of the text, only serves to destroy this tension even more. MT's "until the appointed time", on the other hand, simply sets the stage for the sequence of events in which David sacrifices to the Lord to avert the plague, in 24:25, without specifying ahead of time when its cessation will come about.

In 2 Sam 24:15, therefore, MT's shorter text is to be preferred as the more original, while the text of LXX indicates that its Vorlage joined another tradition concerning the sending of the plague to the text witnessed to in MT.

## 2 Sam 24:25a

MT: ויבן שם דוד מזבח ליהוה ויעל עלות ושלמים

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ωκοδομησεν εκει Δαυειδ θυσιαστηριον Κυριω, και ανηνεγκεν ολοκαυτωσεις και ειρηνικας· και προσεθηκεν Σαλωμων επι το θυσιαστηριον επ' εσχατω, οτι μικρον ην εν πρωτοις.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ωκοδομησεν εκει Δαυιδ θυσιαστηριον τω Κυριω, και ανηνεγκεν ολοκαυτωσεις και ειρηνικας. και προσεθηκεν Σολομων επι το θυσιαστηριον επ' εσχατω, οτι μικρον ην εν πρωτοις.

## 1 Chr 21:26

MT: ויבן שם דויד מזבח ליהוה ויעל עלות ושלמים

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ωκοδομησεν Δαυειδ εκει θυσιαστηριον Κυριω, και ανηνεγκεν ολοκαυτωματα και σωτηριου.

The Greek text contains a plus here, found in OL<sup>V</sup> as well,<sup>142</sup> which tells us that Solomon enlarged David's altar built on the threshing floor of Araunah because it was too small. In the verbatim parallel to MT found in 1 Chr 21:26, there is no mention of Solomon, either in MT or in LXX. At

142 OL<sup>V</sup>: Et imposuit Salomonem super sacrarium in novissimum, quoniam pusillus erat in primis.

2 Chr 3:1, where Solomon begins to build his temple, we are told that it was "on Mt. Moriah, where the Lord had appeared to David, his father, at the place that David had appointed, on the threshing floor of Ornan, the Jebusite," although in its parallel at 1 Kgs 6:1 there is no mention of the threshing floor nor of David's altar there. Opinion is uniform that at 2 Sam 24:25 we have a later addition to the text,<sup>143</sup> although the majority of commentators do not even mention the plus here.<sup>144</sup> Peters maintained that the plus goes back to a Hebrew text which LXX found in its Vorlage, even if it is clearly an addition,<sup>145</sup> while Rehm claimed that this plus is of the same nature as those of 2 Sam 8:7 f, and shows the same solicitude over things concerning the temple which is manifested by the Chronicler.<sup>146</sup>

Since 1 Kgs makes no reference whatsoever to the threshing floor of Araunah in its account of the building of the temple in chapters 5-8, and since 2 Chr 3:1 does include this information, we may see in the plus of 2 Sam 24:25 an addition, not directly quoting, but inspired by the Chronicler's account of the temple construction. It appears highly likely that, because of the construction of the clause οτι μωυρον ην εν πρωτοις, this plus goes back to a Hebrew text which was found in LXX's Vorlage, but it is clearly an addition whose purpose was to harmonize this mention of David's altar with Solomon's temple.

### Conclusions

The results of this examination of non-haplogenic pluses in LXX show that in almost every case MT represents a more original text, and that the plus in LXX are attributable to literary activity on the part of LXX or of its Vorlage.

---

143 Even Thenius admits here the possibility that it may have been added by "the earliest copyist" (Thenius<sup>2</sup>, p. 293).

144 Thus Keil, Erdmann, Wellhausen, Graetz, Driver, Budde, Dhorme, Ehrlich, Kittel, Hertzberg.

145 Peters, p. 158.

146 Rehm, Textkritische Untersuchungen, p. 25

In two instances only, the text of MT shows signs of later redactional activity as far as the pluses are concerned. At 1 Sam 3:21, the short phrase *ויהי דבר יהוה בשלו* does not appear to have been part of the original text, but was a later addition designed to explain the anomalous *ויהי דבר-שמואל* which the original text contained. At 2 Sam 19:11 f., Mt seems to have been at fault in omitting, and then later re-inserting erroneously, an entire clause, whereas LXX witnesses to its more primitive form and position.

In every other case LXX contains a significant plus whose absence from MT may not be attributed to textual error, but rather to an insertion into the text. A number of these pluses seem to fall into categories which may indicate the reasons why such additions were made in the text.

#### 1. Completing the "unsaid".

One characteristic of the insertions is that they appear to be an attempt to complete what in MT was left up to the reader's imagination, or else show the fulfillment of what has been predicted, or the logical sequence to a particular action or situation. Thus, in 1 Sam 30, v.16 tells us that the Egyptian servant had taken David down to the place where the Amalekites were feasting, and v.17 begins, "And David smote them." LXX supplies the logical "And David went upon them," although the original reader was expected to supply this himself. In 2 Sam 11:19-24, where Joab gives his instructions to the messenger in order to inform David of Uriah's death, LXX, having misunderstood the sense of the narrative here, repeats the story of Abimelech's death, which the messenger in fact replaced with another message designed to avoid David's anger. At 2 Sam 24:15, the LXX apparently brings in another tradition here in order to spell out for us that "David chose the plague," as well as to harmonize the coming of the plague with the purchase of the threshing floor of Araunah by specifying that it was the wheat harvest season.

#### 2. Changing the point of view.

A whole series of insertions or modifications of the text in 1 Sam 1:5.6.11.23.28 and 2:11 in LXX serves to emphasize Hannah's sterility but also enlarges Elkanah's rôle

in the proceedings, as well as giving the impression that Samuel's consecration to the Lord is in the form of a Nazirite vow. This latter tendency, while only suggested in LXX's insertions, comes to full bloom in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> which explicitly mentions the nazir at 1:22, a process which probably mirrors a progression in Judaism's understanding of the nature of Samuel's consecration. Again, at 1 Sam 4:1, LXX's modification of the text serves to change the initiative in beginning the war against the Philistines.

3. Added emphasis to the text.

In 1 Sam 8:18, LXX reiterates the fact that it was the people themselves who had chosen a king. Likewise, in 1 Sam 12:23, a small plus emphasizes Samuel's service of the Lord. Again, at 1 Sam 19:22, LXX emphasizes Saul's anger, which in MT was already clear from the context.

4. Material from external sources.

Another series of pluses indicates that LXX has harmonized its narrative by including material from Kgs and Chr in order to show later historical relationships of events in Sam. Thus, at 2 Sam 8:7 f., we are told what happened to the bronze taken from Hadadezer by David through the insertion of material inspired by or directly quoted from Kgs and Chr. At 2 Sam 14:27, the future marriage of Absalom's daughter is included into the LXX text. At 2 Sam 24:25, a text inspired by Chr tells us of Solomon's enlarging of David's altar when he builds the temple.

This tendency to harmonize and explain the text is found at 1 Sam 3:21 as well, where the addition of "from one end of the land to the other" clarifies the meaning of the geographical "from Dan to Beersheba" for those unfamiliar with the Palestinian terrain. In the same verse the addition of the note on the wickedness of Eli's sons serves to join the text more closely to their tragic end in chapter 4. The plus at 1 Sam 14:23 f. shows again LXX's desire to smooth over a more abrupt MT transition, here from the battle scene at Beth-Aven to the forest in which the tempting honey was found.

As far as the degree of certitude for these cases is concerned, except for the places indicated at 1 Sam 3:21 and 2 Sam 19:11 f., I have attempted to show through the examination of each case in the preceding pages that LXX's text has added to the shorter MT in all the verses where a LXX plus is registered. Whether this took place on the level of the Greek translation itself or whether the pluses were already present in its Vorlage is not always possible to determine. When the Hebrew text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> agrees with LXX's longer text, this is a good indication that these readings were already present in Hebrew at the time of LXX's translation as well. In two other cases, 2 Sam 24:15 and 24:25, the grammar of the Greek may indicate a Hebrew Vorlage also.

Whether these additions were already in the Vorlage or not, these pluses in the Greek text clearly show additional literary activity which was performed on a more primitive text resembling that of the shorter MT.



1.2 "Non-haplogenic" pluses in MT

We will examine in this section those readings in which a plus is found in the text of MT vis-à-vis the Greek text whose absence from the Greek may not be ascribed to a simple error of homeoteleuton or homeoarcton.

1 Sam 2:22

MT: ועלי זקן מאד ושמע את כל-אשר יעשון בניו לכל-ישראל  
ואת אשר-ישכבון את-הנשים הצבאות פתח אהל מועד

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και Ηλει πρεσβυτης σφοδρα, και ηκουσεν α εποιουν οι υιοι αυτου τοις υιοις Ισραηλ.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και Ηλει πρεσβυτης σφοδρα και ηκουσεν α εποιουν οι υιοι αυτου τοις υιοις Ισραηλ παντα, και οτι συν-εκοιμωnton οι υιοι αυτου μετα των γυναικων των παρεστηκυιων παρα τας θυρας της σκηνης του μαρτυριου.

LXX<sup>Acx</sup>: και Ηλει πρεσβυτης σφοδρα, και ηκουσεν συν παντα (συμπαντα -Ax) α εποιουν οι υιοι αυτου τοις υιοις Ισραηλ, και ως εκοιμιζον (εκομιζον -A; εκοσμιζον -c) τας γυναικας τας παρεστωσας παρα την θυραν της σκηνης του μαρτυριου.

4QSam<sup>a</sup>:<sup>1</sup> ועלי זקן מאד בן חשעים שנה [ושמונה שנים]  
וישמע [את] אשר [עו]ש'ם בניו לבני ישראל [וויאמר להם]...

The MT plus here, which tells of the scandalous behavior of Eli's sons, is absent from cod B and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, but appears in the hexaplaric (mss A c x) and Ant texts, as well as in Josephus in a slightly different form. Since Wellhausen, most commentators have considered the plus a later addition, indicated by its separation from the other accusations against Eli's sons, by the use of the term "tent of meeting" rather than "temple", and by the desire of a

1 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 57

later age to discredit the priesthood.<sup>2</sup> Barthélemy maintains that "the omission of the two כִּי [in LXX] is much more difficult to explain than their addition," which leads him to conclude that the text of MT attests here to a literary creativity which would have added as well the note on the sins of the Elides in order to bring charges against the priesthood of Shiloh.<sup>3</sup> Thenius observed that the plus was lacking in B, but made no comment upon its originality. Geiger,<sup>4</sup> followed by Böttcher, claimed that it was LXX which had purposely dropped the sentence out of respect for priesthood. Along the same lines, Peters, leaving the question open as to its originality, suggested that the Jews of Alexandria, aware that the Greek translation of the Bible would be read by Gentiles, could have omitted the passage because of its unseemly nature.<sup>5</sup> Fernandez, citing LXX's propensity for smoothing over difficult passages, accepted the MT plus as original.<sup>6</sup> Most modern translations include the plus in their text.<sup>7</sup>

As there is no indication that a textual accident could have caused the omission, it seems clear that we must posit a deliberate modification of the text, either an addition in MT or a deletion in LXX.

Josephus knew of the accusation against Eli's sons although he put it in a different place than that of MT, as he used this story to introduce the section on Samuel.<sup>8</sup>

---

2 Wellhausen, p. 46, followed by Löhr, Klostermann, Driver, Budde, Smith, Nowack, Dhorme (1910 but not 1956), Stoebe, McCarter, NAB, BJ, HÖTTP.

3 Barthélemy, CTAT.

4 A. Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel (Breslau, 1857), p. 272.

5 Peters, p. 103.

6 Fernandez, p. 32.

7 RSV, NEB, Dhorme (1956), Gsty, TOB, Eü.

8 "They dishonoured the women who came for worship, doing violence to some and seducing others by presents," Josephus, Ant.V, 339.

That we find this mentioned by Josephus shows that he knew of the tradition, although whether it was from proto-MT itself or whether it was already in the Greek text in his time is difficult to say. Because of the slightly different formulation and different location, it may attest to a tradition common both to proto-MT and to his text, but one which was not yet stabilized, although Josephus himself may be responsible for the re-working of the material.

The text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> agrees partially with LXX against MT. Note the absence of כל before אשר לנני for MT לנל, and the absence of the plus. 4Q, however, gives Eli's precise age as ninety-eight, while MT and LXX agree on saying merely that he was very old. This extra detail in 4Q is the sign of a later expansion.<sup>9</sup>

The only other mention of the women who were "צנאות" at the door of the tent of meeting is found at Ex 38:8, where the bronze basin of the tent is described as having been made "from the mirrors of the women who ministered at the door of the tent of meeting." Since the historical situation of Ex 38:8 is far from clear itself,<sup>10</sup> its use to clarify 1 Sam 2:22 is limited. It must be noted, however, that, even if the women in Ex 38:8 constitute an addition, the verse was nevertheless part of the text early enough to have been in LXX's Vorlage for Exodus.

9 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 57; Cross, BASOR 132, p. 26. For 4Q שים[ן] Albricht had attributed the final mem to phonetic assimilation before the b (samdhi), but Ulrich, by reading a participle here, avoids the necessity of having recourse to the rare phonetic phenomenon. Note that both Tg and Syr have participles here (ית כל דענדין; kl d<sup>cb</sup> yn).

10 Wellhausen (Composition des Hexateuchs [Berlin, 1899], p. 145) called this part of Ex 38:8 "haggadisch", followed by Holzinger (Exodus, [1890] [KHAT]) and Baentsch (Exodus [1903]). That it is haggadic is contested by Dillmann (Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus [1880], p. 364), who nevertheless considers it a later addition. Heinsch (Das Buch Exodus [1934], p. 254) claims that the mention of these women in Ex 38:8 goes back to their presence in 1 Sam 2:22. Childs (Exodus. A Commentary [1974], p. 636) claims there is insufficient evidence to decide whether older historical material is involved or whether it is

For Ex 38:8, LXX read חצבאת אשר צבאו as των νηστευσσασων αἱ ἐνηστευσαν, followed by OL ieiunabant. Aquila rendered חצבאת as σιτατευομενων (ms v) or σιτατευσαμενων (mss s z), while cod M gives σιτατευομενων for both Aquila and Symmachus. Vg here translated as quae excubabant. At 1 Sam 2:22, Ant, along with cod N, has των παρεστηκυτων for חצבאות, while the hexaplaric text in A c x has τας παρεστωσας. Since παρισταναι = צבא only here, and since Aquila and Symmachus use παρισταναι for יצב, Ulrich suggests that "Acx+ preserve a freer (and therefore probably earlier) translation."<sup>11</sup> Vg for Sam translated as quae observabant, while both Tg and Syr read "who prayed" or "who came to pray" in both Ex and Sam.<sup>12</sup> Childs notes that for Ex 38:8, "some commentators have suggested a cleaning and repairing service, others singing and dancing."<sup>13</sup> For 1 Sam, all seem to be in agreement that some sort of service is referred to. These varying translations show that the early versions were not clear on what type of activity the women performed here. A comparison between LXX Ex 38:8 νηστευσσασων with 1 Sam παρεστωσας shows at least that the later Greek translators of 1 Sam did not look to Ex in order to clarify the meaning of חצבאות.

As far as the term מוֹדֵחַ אֱהִל is concerned, Wellhausen pointed out that it was limited to the Priestly Code, and was incongruous with the mention of הִיכָל in chapters one and three of 1 Sam for the sanctuary at Shiloh.<sup>14</sup> Josh 18-19 places the distribution of the inheritance for the last seven tribes at Shiloh, before the tent of meeting (Josh 18:1

---

later midrashic exegesis, but suggests that the literary form favors the first alternative.

11 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 58.

12 Ex 38:8: Tg נשיא דאחין לצלאה; Syr nš' d'tyn lmzlyw.  
1 Sam 2:22: Tg נשיא דאחין לצלאה; Syr nš' dmzlyn.

13 Childs, p. 636.

14 Wellhausen, p. 46.

and 19:51), which serves to establish the presence of the tent of meeting there, at least in the Priestly tradition. Schulz, citing the possibility that the entire unit of 1 Sam 2:22-25 was a later addition, points out that the plus, with its mention of the tent of meeting, could have been original to that unit, and, therefore, the apparent contradiction between it and the temple would not have been the fault of a later editor.<sup>15</sup> In itself, therefore the presence of this apparently anomalous mention of the tent of meeting does not exclude the possibility that an interpolation was made at an era which would have been before the earliest Greek translation.

The most telling argument against the originality of the MT plus in 1 Sam 2:22, however, arises from the structure of the accusations against the sons of Eli. In the description of their impious behavior in 2:12-17, as well as in the oracle of the condemnation of the House of Eli in 2:27-36, the point of contention is exclusively that of improper treatment of the sacrifices and offerings. If the sin of MT v.22 had been part of the Lord's grievances against Eli's sons, one would expect more than simply the passing reference given in that verse.

The isolated mention of this sin of Hophni and Phineas and the absence of the plus in OG, over against Josephus' knowledge of it, show that this plus must have been inserted into the text sometime between the OG translation and Josephus' writing. Further, the fact that it appears in Josephus in a different location may be an indication that it circulated as an oral tradition before it was finally incorporated into the text. Its close resemblance to Ex 38:8 is still a further indication that the text was not original. On the literary level, the differences between the Greek text and MT also point, as Barthélemy has shown, to an addition on the part of proto-MT.

---

<sup>15</sup> Schulz I, p. 46.

In this case, therefore, LXX witnesses to a more primitive state of the text, into which proto-MT has inserted a plus whose effect is to blacken still further the reputation of Eli's sons.

1 Sam 4:21f.

MT: ותקרא לנער אי-כבוד לאמך<sup>22</sup> גלה כבוד מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל אֶל-הַלֶּקֶח אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים וְאֶל-חֲמִיהּ וְאִישָׁהּ: ותאמר גלה כבוד מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל כִּינִלְקַח אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>21</sup> και εκαλεσεν το παιδαριον Ουαι βαρχαβωθ, υπερ της κιβωτου του θεου και υπερ του πενθερου αυτης και υπερ του ανδρος αυτης. <sup>22</sup> και ειπαν Απωκισται δοξα Ισραηλ, εν τω λημφθηναι τημ κιβωτον Κυριου.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: <sup>21</sup> και εκαλεσεν ονομα τω παιδαριω Ουαι βαρ ιωχαβηδ υπερ της κιβωτου του θεου και υπερ του πενθερου αυτης και υπερ του ανδρος αυτης, οτι απεθανεν. <sup>22</sup> και ειπεν Απωκισται δοξα απο Ισραηλ δι' οτι εληφθη η κιβωτος του θεου.

The LXX here lacks part of the etymological explanation for Ichabod's name in v.21, whereas it is present, along with MT, in v.22. Houbigant noted that the Arabic here contained a truncated form of these two verses: "And she named the boy Jochabed, saying, 'Honor has disappeared from the sons of Israel', because the ark of the covenant of the Lord was taken from them", suggesting that the repetitious material was purposely omitted. His own solution was to omit (v.21) גִּלְיָה כְבוֹד מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל, thus joining לאמר directly to אֶל הַלֶּקֶח אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים, which he attributed to the sacred writer and not to Phineas' wife. Then he omits וְאֶל-חֲמִיהּ וְאִישָׁהּ as the reference to her father-in-law and husband does not really pertain to Israel's lost glory, claiming that these words were added from v.19 by an inexperienced scribe.<sup>16</sup> A number of commentators have followed him in considering the father-in-law and husband as not original in the text.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Houbigant, p. 291.

<sup>17</sup> Peters, Ehrlich, Dhorme (1910), Schulz, BJ<sup>1</sup>.

Thenius suggested that v.22 was a marginal note which had found its way later into the text, while the absence of the words in LXX v.21 was probably due to an accidental omission.<sup>18</sup> Dhorme, who reads with MT, suggested that LXX deliberately omitted the words in v.21 so as not to be in contradiction with v.22.<sup>19</sup> Many, however, have simply read with MT, either with no comment or pointing out that the repetition of the etymology in v.22 served to emphasize the importance of the loss of the ark.<sup>20</sup>

Houbigant pointed out the resemblance between vv. 19 and 21b here:

אל-הלך ארון האלהים ומת חמיה ואישה<sup>19</sup>  
אל-הלך ארון האלהים ואל-חמיה ואישה<sup>21b</sup>

The similarity between these two clauses, plus the fact that, in its context, v.19 makes more sense with ומת whereas ואל appears to be an accommodation to its context in v.21, makes v.21b appear suspect as a mere repetition. That it was not accidental, but rather that the notice concerning the taking of the ark and (the death) of the father-in-law and husband was brought into v.21 on purpose seems indicated by the change of ומת to ואל. The mss b h o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> add απεθνεεν at the end of v.21 in an effort to harmonize the text even further.<sup>21</sup> If these words are a clumsy addition to v.21, however, it must have taken place early on in the history of the text, for they appear in all Greek mss as well. It is easy to see that an early editor, wanting to make the reasons for her grief in v.21 jibe with those of v.19, could have introduced the words into the text.

18 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 18, followed by Wellhausen, Klostermann, Budde, Nowack, Smith, Schulz, Dhorme (1956).

19 Dhorme (1910), p. 50, although he omitted v.22 in 1956.

20 Keil, Erdmann, Hummelauer, Driver, Kittel, Stoebe, Hertzberg, RSV, NEB, BJ<sup>3</sup>, TOB, Eü, BHS.

21 Cf. also the addition of the entire sentence απωκεισται δοξα απο Ισραηλ εν τω λημψθηναι την κιβωτον Κυριου και δια το τεθνηκεναι τον πενθερον αυτης και τον ανδρα αυτης in cod A at the end of v.21.

As we have seen, a number of authors consider v.22 as secondary, although here again, its presence in the entire Greek ms tradition assures us that, if it is an addition, it was an early one. It may be, however, that this verse was always part of the text, for, if v.21b is considered an early addition, the woman's words become simply *גלה כבוד מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל*, which required explanation by the narrator. Thus, the two verses would originally have read, "And she called the baby Ichabod, saying, 'Glory has departed from Israel.' And she said, 'Glory has departed from Israel' because the ark of the God had been taken." At some later time, but before the translation of LXX, an editor, finding the woman's explanation not sufficiently in accord with v.19, and perhaps not sufficiently explicit, inserted the words from v.19. Then, still later, perhaps by the Greek translators themselves, the now repetitious text was ameliorated by removing a different set of words, namely those which had been part of the woman's original speech, thus producing the text found in LXX. This removal was not done very adroitly, however, for the impact of the etymology became lost in the Greek text when it was placed after the mention of the ark and of her relatives. Thus, Houbigant's intuition was basically correct, but he did not realize that *אֵל הַלֵּקָה אִיוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים* of v.21 was also part of the material added from v.19.

In the overloaded text such as it appears in MT, and probably in LXX's Vorlage as well, the impact of v.22 was lost entirely by the inserted mention of the taking of the ark in v.21b. It was, therefore, no longer necessary for the narrator to begin his explanation with "and she said" at the beginning of v.22, and thus the Greek text, which contains *εἰπὼν* in all mss except A b o c<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>, attributes this sentence to the women attending on Phineas' wife as she was dying (cf. v.20). No correction to *וּתְאִמְרָנָה* is necessary for this plural in the Greek which arose as a consequence of an earlier disturbance in the text.

Thus a text which had been overloaded early on by the introduction of the mention of the ark and the father-in-law and husband of Phineas' wife from a previous verse



was "corrected" by LXX in order to avoid the repetition. It was done in such a way, however, that part of the original Hebrew text was removed, while most of the overloading addition was left in place in Greek. No correction of MT according to LXX is necessary here, although an early Hebrew text, which was common to proto-MT and LXX's Vorlage shows evidence of material which had been added from v.19.

### 1 Sam 17-18

Chapter 17 and 18 of 1 Sam, recounting David's slaying of Goliath and the beginning of the enmity between David and Saul, provide a complex of pluses and variants between the Hebrew and Greek texts, and within the Greek text tradition itself. Large blocks of material, 17:12-31, 17:55-18:5, 18:10-11. 17-19. 29b-30, plus several verses or half-verses, 17:41.48.50, 18:6.12.21, are missing from cod B (and hence from CG), while pluses in the Greek text are found at 17:26.43.

In its shorter text form, cod B is followed by a small number of mss (N a n v y b<sub>2</sub>), whereas the majority follows cod A in containing the MT pluses. As for the other ancient versions, OL<sup>v</sup>, Tg, Syr, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion and Vg all follow the fuller MT.

Although he later abandoned the position, Wellhausen led the way for others in claiming that the plus sections in MT were later additions to the text and that LXX witnesses to a more primitive form in which the story is told, undisturbed by the contradictions found in MT.<sup>22</sup> Thenius, on the other hand, while maintaining that the author of chapters 17 and 18 was different from that of chapter 16, and that it was a collector or editor who put the sections together "as well as he could", considered nevertheless that these pluses in Mt were an integral part of the text.<sup>23</sup>

22 Wellhausen, p. 104 f., followed by Klostermann, Smith, Peters, Nowack, Schulz, Stoebe, McCarter, NAB.

23 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 68. The originality of the longer MT is also accepted by Keil, Erdmann, Vercellone, Driver, Budde, Dhorme, Graetz, Kittel, RSV, NEB, BJ, Osty, BHS.

There are a number of manifest contradictions in the text within chapters 16-18. The largest plus in MT, 17:12-31, portrays David as a shepherd boy in Bethlehem who brought provisions to his brothers at the front, while in the section 16:14-23 David is a "man of war" (16:18), Saul's armor bearer (16:21) and a soul-soothing musician (16:23) who had been summoned to Saul's court to provide remedial music against Saul's evil spirit. David, although already known to the reader from chapter 16, is re-introduced in 17:12 as the son of Jesse and, although he was Saul's musician and armor bearer, the latter must ask, in 17:55-58, whose son he is. In 18:10f., the episode of Saul throwing his spear at David is seemingly repeated in 19:9f., although it is in the first of these accounts that MT tells us, "But David evaded him twice." Finally, in 18:17-19, Saul promises to give his daughter Merab to David although in the verses immediately following, 20-21, it is Michal who is promised to him. It is this series of contradictions which led Wellhausen originally to consider the MT pluses as later additions.

Regardless of which is the more original form, it seems clear, both from the manuscript evidence and from the nature of the Greek translation of these "plus" verses, that they were not a part of the original OG. Wellhausen and Driver point out that 17:12-31, in cod A, is much closer to MT than is the rest of the chapter.<sup>24</sup> Several peculiarities of translation (17:23 ο μεσσωτος for הנניס while in 17:4 it is translated δυνατος; ο φιλιστιαιος for הפלשתי while the books of Samuel elsewhere regularly translate it as ο αλλοφυλος) show that the Greek translation extant for these pluses was made at a different time from the rest of OG.<sup>25</sup>

The question remains, however, as to the original form of these chapters, for the problem here is that one is caught between two text-critical principles -- one must choose

<sup>24</sup> Wellhausen, p. 104; Driver, p. 140.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Wellhausen, p. 104.

choose between the lectio difficilior, represented by MT with its numerous contradictions, and the lectio brevior, which is found in LXX. In the form in which these chapters appear in MT, it seems patently obvious that there is a combination or mixture of more than one tradition. The evidence of more than one tradition is present, however, in the LXX text as well, as Driver observed, for even in LXX a certain number of contradictions may be found.<sup>26</sup> David, in 17:38ff., which is one of the parts common to MT and LXX, is portrayed as being unused to the soldier's armor although in 16:18 he is called a "man of war". Thus, even in LXX's more unified text, contradictions occur.

Barthélemy has based his defense of MT on the fact that it is precisely at those points in the text which are problematic that LXX registers a "minus" (e.g., 17:12 and 17:55), thus indicating an attempt at harmonization and coherence in the narrative on the part of LXX.<sup>27</sup> On the other hand, those who consider LXX's text more original see MT's pluses as interpolations, either from another separate and independent tradition about David,<sup>28</sup> or from various pieces of information about him which, even though they never formed a unified narrative by themselves, gave additional details to the famous encounter with the Philistine giant and about Saul's subsequent animosity.<sup>29</sup> Those who accept LXX as a unified narrative naturally see the MT pluses as coming from another tradition or traditions. It must be noted, however, that the whole of chapter 17, along with 18:1-5, in its longer MT form, may have constituted a single, unified ac-

---

26 Driver, p. 150.

27 Barthélemy, "La qualité ...," p. 20.

28 Klostermann and Peters.

29 Schulz, Stoebe. Cf. H.J. Stoebe, "Die Goliathperikope 1 Sam XVII.1-XVIII.5, VT 6 (1956) 397-413. He calls the MT pluses "freie Erweiterungen ebenso aus volkstümlichen wie aus theologischen Motiven" (p. 404).

count,<sup>30</sup> and the break after v.31 in LXX may be, in fact, artificial. Several factors suggest this rather clearly.

1. At 17:1, the Philistines gather for battle against the Israelites. Up until this point, in chapter 16, the narration has been concerned with the anointing of David, in 16:1-13, and Saul's evil spirit, in 16:14-23, with no mention of war. It seems, therefore, that 17:1 begins a new episode which is entirely separate from what preceded.

2. The re-introduction of David in 17:12 has the appearance of beginning a new section. In 17:1-11, however, David does not appear at all, and if the episode concerning Goliath begins in 17:1, then, within the context of this story, the presentation of David in 17:12 appears to be in its rightful place, after Goliath's challenge has been made to the Israelites.

The problematic v.12 may, however, not be in its original state in MT. Its opening clause, וידוד בן-איש, היה מביט לחם יהודה ושמו ישי, was rendered, in cod A, και ειπεν Δαυειδ υιος ανθρωπου Εφραθαιου ουτος εκ βηθλεεμ Ιουδα και ονομα αυτου Ιεσσαυ. Cod A alone contains ειπεν, which appears as ην in mss c d f m s w x, and was omitted by the rest of the mss. Cod A's και ειπεν Δαυειδ may have been mistakenly introduced from v.32, where the OG narrative takes up again with these words, after v.11. While it is an additional sign that vv.12-31 were missing from OG, it sheds little light on the original reading for v.12.<sup>31</sup>

Driver suggested that הזה was either "a late and unskilful insertion made with the view of identifying the

30 Cf. Budde, KHAT, p. 121, who attributes 17:1-18:5 to "E". Dhorme follows suit, after pointing out several redactional verses (17:12-15.47.50.54).

31 Dhorme (1956) saw this repetition as the occasion of a textual accident. "L'oeil du scribe a passé de la première à la seconde phrase, sautant ainsi toute une colonne du Vaticanus" (p. 870, note on 17:12), but και ειπεν Δαυειδ can hardly have been original in v.12.

"איש אפרתי", or "an error for היה,"<sup>32</sup> (cf. Syr: hw'), although he goes on to say that no verb is required here. König suggested that it might have mistakenly entered here from an original האיש הזה in the following line,<sup>33</sup> while Gesenius-Kautzsch called it a later addition.<sup>34</sup> Budde pointed out that the Greek οὗτος here implies הוא,<sup>35</sup> although both the Greek and Syr here may be attempts to make sense out of the problematic הזה. In 16:1, Jesse was already presented as a Bethlehemite, and in 17:58, David answers Saul that he is the son of Jesse the Bethlehemite. If the whole of chapter 17 was once independent from chapter 16, and if the original text (or oral tradition) of 17:12 presented Jesse as an Ephrathite, the entire phrase הזה מניה לחם could be the sign of an early harmonization needed to join the two stories. This, however, does not indicate that 17:12 begins a new narrative, but only that the harmonization was made at the point at which it was required, namely when David entered upon the scene.

3. Another indication of the original unity of chapter 17 as it appears in MT is found in a comparison of the MT and LXX forms of 17:26 and 36. In MT, 17:26 reads ויאמר דוד אל-האנשים העמדים עמו לאמר מה-יעשה לאיש אשר יכה את-הפלשתי הלז והסיר חרפה מעל ישראל כי מי הפלשתי הערל הזה כי חרף מערכות אלהים חיים, which cod A rendered as και ειπεν Δαυειδ προς τους ανδρας τους συσσηκτους μετ' αυτου λεγων η ποιηθησεται τω ανδρι ος αν παταξει τον αλλοφυλον εκεινον και αφελει ονειδισμον απο Ισραηλ. οτι τις αλλοφυλος ο απεριτμητος αυτος οτι ωνειδισεν παραταξιν θεου ζωντος; In MT v.36b we read והיה הפלשתי הערל הזה כאחד מהם, whereas in cod B v.36b we find και εσται ο αλλοφυλος ο απεριτμητος ως εν τούτων· ουχι πορευσομαι και παταξω αυτον, και αφελω σημερον ονειδος εξ Ισραηλ; διοτι τις ο απεριτμητος ουτος ος ωνειδισεν παραταξιν θεου ζωντος; Schulz maintained that v.26b was original and was

32 Driver, p. 140.

33 Lehrgebäude. Syntax, 334d.

34 Gesenius-Kautzsch, 126x.

35 Budde, KHAT, p. 124.

then inserted into LXX v.36b.<sup>36</sup> Thenius, Dhorme, Budde, Peters and McCarter maintain the originality of the LXX form of v.36, that it was (in part) inserted into v.26, and then that the LXX plus of v.36 was lost from MT through an accident due to homeoteleuton at הענין הזה.<sup>37</sup> Wellhausen claimed that v.36b in LXX "bore the mark of a targum."<sup>38</sup>

If the LXX form of v.36b is original, and if vv. 12-31 were inserted at a later date, v.36 must have served as the inspiration for v.26. The clause in LXX v.36 οὐχι πορευσομαι και παταξω αυτον, και αφελω σημερον ονειδος εξ Ισραηλ; διοτι τις ο απεριτητος ουτος appears, however, to be an insertion from v.26, added to v.36b by LXX or its Vorlage in order to maintain this motivation on David's part for avenging the insult to the Israelites. No apparent reason may be adduced to show that MT's shorter form in v.36 is not original. If such was the case, then it is difficult to maintain that the earliest Greek text had no knowledge of vv.11-31.

4. At 17:16 it is said simply that "for forty days the Philistine came forward and took his stand, morning and evening," and later, in 17:23, we are told that he came and "spoke the same words as before." Both of these imply that Goliath had already set forth his challenge, which we find in 17:8-10, while there is nothing in the section 17:12-31 which indicates what Goliath's challenge was.

5. At 17:55-58, after David has slain Goliath, Saul must ask whose son he is. This is obviously in contradiction to 16:14-23 but, within chapter 17 itself it is never stated until this point that Saul knows who David is. On the contrary, these final verses of chapter 17 seem to constitute

---

36 Schulz I, p. 268.

37 If this had been the case, however, one must, as Budde suggests (KHAT, p. 128), posit the later restoration of מאחר מהם. If these words could have been added, however, it is surprising that the whole passage was not restored.

38 Wellhausen, p. 106.

the point of the whole chapter -- the identification of the giant-killer as David, son of Jesse, whereas the story of David as musician and armor-bearer to Saul, left off in 16:23, does not resume until later in chapter 18.

6. Finally, in 1 Sam 20:8 (which is common to both MT and LXX, David refers to the covenant between himself and Jonathan. This appears to be a resonance of the covenant made by them in 18:3, even though this pericope is missing from OG.

The conclusion seems to be, therefore, that 17:1-18:5 form an original unity, and that they existed as a part of the text at least prior to the time of the LXX translation. There is nothing within these verses themselves that is contradictory. When later editors began removing material which was problematic, it must be noted that for 17:12-31 and 17:55-18:5 the "offensive" material contradicted information found in chapter 16 or in chapter 18 after v.5. In performing its harmonizing surgery, LXX has ended up with fragments of different sources which were not originally intended to go together.

It should not be overlooked that in its longer form the MT is a conglomerate of at least two different Davidic traditions: one, 17:1-18:5, which recounts the heroic story of the shepherd boy, son of Jesse of Bethlehem, who responded to the Philistine giant's challenge, saved the day for the Israelites, and wound up the best friend of the king's son and as head of the army; the other, apparently carved up to fit around the hero story, includes at least 16:14:23 and 18:(6)7-16. In this tradition, David, whose shepherd origins are present but not emphasized (16:19), becomes the king's musician, his armor-bearer, and finally a great warrior whose skill in battle eventually surpasses that of the king himself and thus creates deep jealousy and hatred on the king's part.

At 18:6, when the victorious Israelites return home from battle, MT begins ויהי בנואם בשוב דור מהכות אה-פלשתים, which is absent from OG. In the same verse, when the women come out to greet the heroes, MT reads לקראת שאול המלך,

while the Greek has εἰς συναντησὶν Δαυεὶδ (only mss b g o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> read εἰς ἀπαντησὶν Σαουλ τοῦ Βασιλεως). From 18:6b on, including the song of the women in 18:7 ("Saul has slain his thousands and David his ten thousands"), absolutely no mention is made of David's heroic slaying of Goliath, which hardly seems normal if the deed was so famous and extraordinary. This would seem to indicate that 18:6b takes up again the previous tradition of David, left off in 16:23. MT 18:6a shows that text's transition between these two traditions which OG had omitted,. OG forms its own transition by modifying Saul to David as the person to whom the women come to sing their song.

Josephus seems to have known both the MT and the LXX forms of these chapters. Agreeing with MT, he presents Goliath's challenge as repeated for forty days (Ant VI, 174; cf. 17:16), and appears to try to harmonize the contradictions between 16:14.23 and 17:12ff, by writing, "Now, on the outbreak of the war between the Hebrews and the Philistines, Saul had sent David away to his father Jesse, being content with the latter's three sons..."<sup>39</sup> At Ant VI, 183, he records David's desire to repair the reproach made to God (17:36) without including the LXX plus here. On the other hand, with regard to Goliath's height, in 17:4, Josephus follows LXX's four cubits rather than MT's six (Ant VI, 171), and in David's response to Goliath in 17:43 he follows LXX's plus almost literally (οὐχι τοιούτου ἀλλὰ καὶ χεῖρω κυνός [Ant VI, 186], for LXX καὶ εἶπεν Δαυεὶδ, Οὐχι ἀλλ' ἡ χεῖρω κυνός).

Although no fragments of these chapters have been found in any of the texts of Qumran Cave IV, a tiny fragment of 1 Sam 18:17-18 was discovered in Cave I,<sup>40</sup> thus confirming

39 Ant. VI, 175.

40 D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 1: Qumran Cave I (Oxford, 1955), p. 64, identify the following fragment as being from 1 Sam 18:17-18:  
 מלחמה מלחמה  
 [יהל]17  
 [שואל]18.



the presence of at least this part of the MT plus at Qumran.

With regard to the further pluses of MT at 18:10 f., 18:17-19 and 18:29b-30, if one accepts the conglomerate nature of the apparently older MT, these pluses may be seen as being of a piece with the rest of MT, which LXX eliminated in its desire to unify the text.

Thus, the fact that 17:1-18:5 may be shown to form an originally unified text, along with resonances of material found within the MT plus section elsewhere in places common to MT and LXX (David's covenant with Jonathan in 18:3 and 20:8), plus the fact that LXX seems suspiciously to break off precisely in those places which appear to cause difficulty, make it seem far more likely that the longer MT form of chapters 17-18 presents the earlier text, which was abbreviated by LXX. What was originally a conglomerate of two or more independent traditions concerning David's youth and early association with Saul was amputated by LXX in order to present one more or less unified story. It was cut up in such a way, however, that the particulars of the once-separate traditions were not respected, as their concatenation in the primitive text was seen by the LXX editors, looking at a coherent flow of narrative, simply as a series of contradictions which had to be rectified.

# 1 Sam 23:23

MT: וראו ודעו מכל המחבאים אשר יתחבא שם ושבתם אלי אל-נכון  
והלכתי אחכם והיה אם-ישנו בארץ וחפשתי אתו בכל אלפי יהודה

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ιδετε και γνωτε, και πορευσομεθα μεθ' υμων\* και  
εσται ει εστιν επι της γης, και εξερעυνησω αυτον εν  
πασαις χιλιαισιν Ιουδα.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ιδετε και γνωτε εκ παντων των τοπων ουπου αυτος  
κρυπτεται εκει, και επιστρεψατε προς με εις ετοιμον,  
και πορευσομαι μεθ' υμων, και εσται ει εστιν επι  
της γης, εξερעυνησω αυτον εν πασαις χιλιαισιν Ιουδα.

As David is hiding from Saul, the latter engages the Ziphites to search out his hiding place among them. The

MT contains a plus here in which Saul gives specific instructions to find his hiding places and to report back to him. The plus is absent from cod B (OG), but appears in the hexaplaric and Ant texts.<sup>41</sup> OL<sup>v</sup> follows cod B in lacking the plus.

Only a small number of authors have followed Wellhausen in considering this MT plus as not part of the original text. He rejected the possibility that it might be either an accidental or a deliberate omission on OG's part, and notes that it is in no way necessary for the Hebrew narrative,<sup>42</sup> while Klostermann called it an explicatory variant to v.22a.<sup>43</sup> Budde, in SBOT, struck it out as "a gloss on וראו ויעו," although he re-admitted it as original in KHAT, claiming that LXX deliberately omitted to relieve an "overloaded text."<sup>44</sup> Finally, McCarter suggests that "it may be an old variant of v.22a," and prefers the LXX<sup>B</sup> reading.<sup>45</sup> The vast majority of authors, however, either has no comment on the MT plus or prefers MT as original.<sup>46</sup>

There is no apparent reason here why the words would have fallen out accidentally from the text. It is true that there is a certain similarity between vv.23 and 22, where Saul begins his instructions to the Ziphites by telling them "Know and see the place where his foot is", וראו ויעו but, aside from וראו ויעו, where the order is changed, none of the vocabulary is repeated in v.23. Dhorme points out that "the redundancy of the expression makes the adventure which follows more lively."<sup>47</sup>

41 In mss A c x and b e j(mg) m(mg) o w c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>.

42 Wellhausen, p. 129, followed by Nowack.

43 Klostermann, p. 103, followed by Smith and Schulz.

44 Budde, SBOT, p. 70; KHAT, p. 159.

45 McCarter, p. 378.

46 Thus Thenius, Keil, Erdmann, Graetz, Hummelauer, Driver, Peters, Budde (KHAT), Dhorme, Ehrlich, Kittel, Hertzberg, RSV, NEB, NAB, BJ, Osty, TOB, Eü, BHS, HOTTP.

47 Dhorme, p. 212.

We have already seen in 1 Sam 4:21 f. that LXX has sought to lighten an apparently overloaded text, and here again in 23:23 the same kind of activity appears to have been at work.

1 Sam 30:7

MT: וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֶל-אַבִּיחָתָר הַכֹּהֵן בֶּן-אֲחִימֶלֶךְ הַגִּישָׁה-נָּא לִי הָאֶפֶד  
וַיֵּגֶשׁ אַבִּיחָתָר אֶת-הָאֶפֶד אֶל-דָּוִד

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ειπεν Δαυειδ προς Αβιαθαρ τον ιερεα υιον Αχι-  
μελεχ, προσαγαγε το εφουδ.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ειπεν Δαυειδ προς Αβιαθαρ τον ιερεα υιον Αχι-  
Acx: μελεχ, προσαγαγε το εφουδ. και προσηγαγεν Αβιαθαρ  
το εφουδ προς Δαυειδ.

When David asks Abiathar for the ephod, LXX in all mss except A b c o x c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> lacks the statement that "Abiathar brought the ephod to David." Enough of the verse is present in OL<sup>V</sup> to insure that this text contained the plus as well.<sup>48</sup> Vg, Tg and Syr read the longer text along with MT.

In this case, McCarter stands alone in attributing the plus to an insertion on MT's part,<sup>49</sup> whereas all others, and all modern translations, include it as part of the authentic text. Most have no comment on the minus in LXX,<sup>50</sup> although Dhorme and Stoebe attribute the loss to homeotel-euton.<sup>51</sup> Strictly speaking, this would not account for the loss of דָּוִד-אֶל, however, and the OG absence may simply be attributed to carelessness on the part of a scribe.

It must be noted that לִי נָּא- is also absent from Ant texts which otherwise carry the longer MT.<sup>52</sup>

48 Adduc ephod. Et adduxit.

49 McCarter, p. 431.

50 Thenius, Wellhausen, Keil, Erdmann, Hummelauer, Klostermann, Graetz, Budde (SBOT), Nowack, Smith, Driver, Ehrlich, Hertzberg.

51 Dhorme (1910), p. 250. Stoebe suggests a textual accident here as a possibility ("Fortfall durch Homoeotel?"[p.506]).

52 Aquila and Symmachus seem to be more careful in following the Hebrew text. In ms j: α' σ' σιησον προς με την επωμιδα; α' προσεγγισον δη μοι το επενφυμα. In ms z:

Since both *נא לי* and *אל-דוד* are unaccountably absent from the Greek, it may be possible that the original Greek text had eliminated these phrases, along with the statement that "Abiathar brought the ephod", on purpose, reasoning that, if the ephod was worn by the high priest, it would have been unseemly for David to wear it himself. As LXX now stands, the text says only that David asked for the ephod to be brought, and not that it was brought to him. At 1 Sam 23:9, in a similar situation in which the oracle is consulted, MT and LXX agree on a shorter text in which it is reported *ויאמר אל-אביתר הכהן הגישה האפוד*. The result of LXX's shortening in 30:7 is that this text is brought into conformity with 23:9.

Thus, it is not clear of this MT plus was eliminated on purpose by OG or if it fell out of the text accidentally. In any event, MT's longer text is to be preferred here as more original.

### Conclusions

In these cases in which a non-haplogenic plus is found in MT, only at 1 Sam 2:22 is there evidence that proto-MT has inserted additional material. The report there of the sin of Eli's sons is not referred to elsewhere, and appears to be extraneous to the more primitive form of the narrative which concentrates exclusively on their misbehavior with regard to the sacrifices. Unlike the pluses we found in LXX in Section 1.1, this proto-MT addition stands out immediately as "foreign matter", and indicates no attempt whatsoever to harmonize or smooth out the narrative.

In all the other cases, LXX has sought to lighten what it considered to be an overloaded, redundant or contradictory text. At 1 Sam 4:21 f., the pre-MT appears to have in fact been overloaded with material from v.19. The

---

α' ἐγγύσων μοι τὴν ἐπωμίδα. McCarter, although he follows the shorter text of cod B, includes *נא לי* in his translation: "'Bring me the ephod!'" (p. 429).

LXX form, however, suggests that this process had already taken place at a stage earlier than the Greek translation, and LXX's attempt at lightening the text removed original material but left an overloading addition in place.

For the complex of pluses in chapters 17 and 18, I have tried to show that MT represents an early conglomerate of disparate traditions. The section 17:1-18:5 once formed a unit in itself which must have pre-dated LXX's attempt to remove the contradictions between it and the surrounding material in chapters 16 and 18:6 ff.

At 1 Sam 23:23, MT's fuller text, with its apparent redundancy from v.22, was shortened by LXX to provide a lighter text. And finally, at 1 Sam 30:7, LXX may either have suffered an accidental loss, or it purposely eliminated what it found to be not in conformity with 1 Sam 23:9 and with its conception of the use of the ephod.

In each of these cases, apart from 1 Sam 2:22, LXX shows us an edition which was not afraid to eliminate passages which it saw as somehow disturbing the over-all narrative, while MT presents a more original, even if occasionally problematic, text.

### 1.3 Pluses and minuses of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in relation to MT

In this section we will examine those cases in which 4QSam<sup>a</sup> presents a plus or minus in relation to MT where LXX does not agree with 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

#### 1 Sam 10:27-11:1

MT: ובני בליעל אמרו מה-ישענו זה ויבזהו ולא-הביאו לו מנחה  
ויהי כמחריש<sup>1</sup> ויעל נחש העמוני ויחן על-יבש גלעד...

LXX<sup>B</sup>: 27 και υιοι λοιμοι ειπαν Τις σωσει ημας ουτος; και ητιμησαν αυτον, και ουκ ηνεγκαν αυτω δωρα. <sup>1</sup>και εγενηθη ως μετα μηνα και ανεβη Ναας ο Αμμανειτης και παρεμβαλλει επι Ιαβεις Γαλααδ...

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: 27 και οι υιοι λοιμοι ειπον Τις σωσει ημας; ουτος; και ητιμωσαν αυτον, και ουκ ηνεγκαν αυτω δωρα. και εγενηθην ως κωφευων. <sup>1</sup>και εγενετο μετα μηνα ημερων, και ανεβη Ναας ο Αμμανιτης και παρενεβαλεν επι Ιαβις Γαλααδ...

4QSam<sup>a</sup>:<sup>1</sup>

5. [זה וי] בזוהו ולוא הביאו לו מנחה vacat
6. [ונ] חש מלך בני עמון הוא לחץ את בני גד ואת בני ראובן בחזקה ונקר להם כ[ול]
7. [וע] ין ימין ונתן אי[מה ופחד] על [י] שראל ולוא נשאר איש בבני ישראל אשר<sup>2</sup> בע[בר]
8. [הירדן אש] ל[וא נ] קר לו נח[ש מלך] בני [ע] מון כול עין ימין רק שבעת אלפים איש ויהו כמו חדש
9. [נסו מפני] בני עמון ויבאו אל [י] בש גלעד ויאמרו כול ויעל נחש העמוני ויחן על יביש [גלעד]
- אנשי יביש אל נחש [vac]at
10. [העמוני כרת] ל[נו ברית ונעבדך ויאמר א] ל[יה] ה נחש [העמוני בזאת] אכ[רת לכם]

1 F. M. Cross, "The Ammonite Oppression of the Tribes of Gad and Reuben: Missing Verses from 1 Samuel 11 Found in 4QSamuel<sup>a</sup>," in HGTS, p. 107.

2 This אשר is not found in Cross's reconstruction but has been added by D. Barthélemy (private communication).

A plus of approximately three and a half lines in the text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> at 10:27-11:1 tells of Nahash the Ammonite's treatment of the Gadites and Reubenites: he gouged out the right eyes of all but seven thousand who managed to escape to Jabesh-Gilead. At this point the text continues in agreement with MT, with the exception of the final clause of the 4Q plus, ויהי כמו חרש, which agrees with LXX αὐ εἰσενηθη σὺς μετὰ μνηστῶν against MT ויהי כמחריש. The plus of 4Q is not found in the Greek text, although Josephus contains a large part of it. In Josephus' account, however, Μῆτι δ' ὁστροπον begins the section containing the plus rather than ending it as in 4Q.<sup>3</sup>

Already before the plus of 4Q was known, an overwhelming majority of authors emended the Hebrew text of this verse to agree with LXX: ויהי כמחוש.<sup>4</sup> Keil, however, appealed to the parallel construction of the Hebrew syntax here (הלך in v.26a with וילכו v.26b; אמרו v.27a with ויהי v.27b) in order to defend the MT reading.<sup>5</sup> Buber claimed that the verb may be understood to mean not only "be silent", but also "be impassive, immovable" (cf. Ex 14:14; 2 Sam 19:11), and that כמחריש means "as one who after an organic infirmity can neither hear nor respond." He would translate it accordingly as "as a deaf mute."<sup>6</sup> Stoebe points out that Saul's silence here is an expression of his trust in God,<sup>7</sup> in his knowledge of God's choice of him as king.

---

3 Josephus, Ant. VI, 68-71.

4 Ewald, Thenius, Wellhausen, Löhr, Graetz, Driver, Smith, Budde, Nowack, Dhorme, Schulz, Ehrlich, Kittel, NEB, BJ, Osty.

5 Keil, p. 81. Cf. also Erdmann and Rehm.

6 M. Buber, "Die Erzählung von Sauls Königswahl," VT 6 (1956), p. 146. He notes there Lagarde's translation as "tongue-tied". Hertzberg has followed Buber in reading with MT here.

7 Stoebe, p. 219.

With the discovery of the large plus in 4Q, Cross maintains that 4Q preserves the original full reading which both clears up the disputed words between 10:27 and 11:1, and gives a more satisfactory explanation of Nahash's behavior with the people of Jabesh-Gilead.<sup>8</sup> He attributes the lack of mention of the seven thousand refugees in Josephus' text as well as his placing the month's time lapse at the beginning of his account, to a vertical dittography in his Vorlage which would have written ויהי כמוחש erroneously at the beginning of the first paragraph of this account as well as in its rightful place as in 4Q. Then a haplography due to homeoteleuton took place, causing the loss of a paragraph.<sup>9</sup>

Cross bases his preference for the originality of 4Q here on six factors. First, the expression נחש מלך בני עמון in 4Q is a more satisfactory way of presenting a king for the first time than MT's נחש העמוני (11:1), which would be the only case in Sam-Kgs where the invariable pattern had not been used.<sup>10</sup>

Second, the sentence הוא לחץ את בני גר ואח בני ראובן נחקה constitutes a "Deuteronomistic cliché", which may point to the paragraph's authenticity, although Cross admits that such clichés are easily imitated.<sup>11</sup>

Third, the seven thousand who escaped, a round number, is appropriate to the style of such a narrative.<sup>12</sup>

Fourth, the episode in the 4Q plus "also presumes the traditional conflict between Ammon and the Isrealite inhabitants of Transjordan," although the account in Judg 10:6-11:40 is different and has few verbal contacts with the plus here. Nor is there any sign of direct dependence on Judg 21:1-25.<sup>13</sup>

8 Cross, "The Ammonite Oppression...", p. 115.

9 Cross, pp. 110 f.

10 Cross, p. 111.

11 Cross, p. 112.

12 Cross, p. 112.

13 Cross, pp. 112 f.



Fifth, the phrase **ויהי כמו חרש** is an archaic expression which makes sense in the context, whereas the reading in MT here is "awkward and troublesome".<sup>14</sup> Gen 38:24 presents a similar archaism in **ויהי כמשלש חרשים** (Samaritan Pentateuch: **ויהי כמשלש חרשים**). The temporal phrase in 1 Sam here makes perfect sense in providing the transition between the escape of the seven thousand and the expedition of Nahash against Jabesh-Gilead, which had provided them sanctuary.<sup>15</sup>

Finally, since he finds no "haggadic" element in the plus which would suggest that it was a later addition, but rather a text which gives "flat historical facts", Cross claims that there is no reason for not accepting the text as genuine.<sup>16</sup> He concludes that the plus provides a necessary historical reason for explaining Nahash's sudden, harsh treatment of the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead, as they had only a month earlier provided refuge for the seven thousand who had escaped from his campaign against the Gadites and Reubenites.<sup>17</sup>

Cross does not discuss in his article why this text is not found in MT or LXX, but Ulrich claims that it is plausible that it was originally found in OG, and that this is an example of an excision from the Greek text based on its absence from MT.<sup>18</sup> He does not say, however, how the plus came to be lacking in MT. McCarter writes that "the omission [from MT and LXX] apparently was not haplographic -- there seems to be nothing in the text to have triggered it. A scribe simply skipped an entire paragraph of his text."<sup>19</sup>

---

14 Noting that early Hebrew orthography would have written **כמחרש**, Cross finds an indication of the archaic expression in Ugaritic, where "km is often written with its following noun, without the word divider" (pp. 113 and 118, note 18).

15 Cross, p. 113.

16 Cross, p. 114.

17 Cross, p. 115.

18 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 169.

19 McCarter, p. 199.

Barthélemy has recently opposed the acceptance of this 4Q plus as original.<sup>20</sup> He points out, first of all, that the historical explanation given in the plus which describes Nahash's behavior toward the people of Gad and Reuben, while it makes sense according to the perspectives of the Deuteronomistic historian, could just as easily indicate a gloss which attempted to explain Nahash's abrupt assault on Jabesh-Gilead. At the same time, since Tov has shown that the later redaction of Jeremiah is characterized by Deuteronomistic additions,<sup>21</sup> and since it is admitted that there were several layers of redaction in the Deuteronomistic history, it is possible that this plus of 4Q could attest to a final redactional development which was unknown to MT or to LXX. Barthélemy points out that the fact that the plus seems to have been inserted in a slightly different place in 4Q and in Josephus (in relation to *ויהי כמו חרש*) is an indication of its being a later and as yet unstabilized addition.<sup>22</sup>

As far as the choice between *כמו חרש/כמחרש* is concerned, Barthélemy prefers the MT reading here. He criticizes Cross' appeal to the archaic form of the Ugaritic *km*, noting that there is only one case in which it precedes a noun (contrary to Cross' note that it is "often written with its following noun without the word divider."<sup>23</sup>), and in that text the scribe seems to have left out the word divider in several other places as well.<sup>24</sup> With regard to the similar

---

20 Barthélemy, CTAT.

21 Cf. E. Tov, "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie," RB 79 (1972), pp. 196 f.

22 Note that the same phenomenon occurs with regard to the Song of Hannah in 1 Sam 2:1-10, where it appears to have been inserted in a slightly different place in the MT, LXX and 4Q traditions.

23 Cross, p. 118, note 18.

24 C. H. Gordon, Ugaritic Manual, II: Texts in Transliteration (Rome, 1955), text 51.

archaism of Gen 38:24, Barthélemy points out that it is the only example of a masculine noun modified by a number from three to ten which is also masculine. Further, it is one of the very rare cases in which the dagesh forte of the assimilated מן has disappeared before a normal letter vocalized with shewa. Thus all the ancient grammarians consider מְשַׁלַּשׁ as a substantive of the type מַעֲלֵל.<sup>25</sup> He concludes that the normal expression for OG's Vorlage at 10:27 should be וַיְהִי כְחֹשׁ.<sup>26</sup> Smith, having noted the same objection, proposed an original כְּחֹשׁ,<sup>27</sup> as, in fact, appears at 4Q, but this was objected to by Budde on the grounds that such an expression would not appear in prose.<sup>28</sup>

In favor of the MT reading Barthélemy notes, first of all, Keil's appeal to the syntactic symmetry noted above. Further, the expression -כִּי הָיָה before a participle or agent noun ordinarily indicates "to behave like".<sup>29</sup> Thirdly, the hiphil of חָשׂ usually has the meaning "to control oneself", "to impose silence on oneself,"<sup>30</sup> which goes well in the context of 10:27. Fourthly, this desire on Saul's part not to react to an insult occurs again in 11:13, where Saul refuses to put anyone to death for having opposed his kingship. Finally, the principal argument in favor of MT is the abruptness of the passage from 10:27 to 11:1. While LXX has a tendency to eliminate the signs of division of literary heterogeneousness, MT tends to maintain them intact.<sup>31</sup>

It is surprising that such a long and striking section should have disappeared completely from view in both MT and LXX. If the plus is genuine, it does provide, as

25 Barthélemy cites Abulwalid, Ibn Ezra, Radak, Japheth ben-Ali and Rashi.

26 Cf. 1 Sam 25:38.

27 Smith, p. 77.

28 Budde (KHAT), p. 73.

29 "Se comporther en...". He cites Ex 22:24; Hos 5:10; Job 24:14.

30 2 Sam 13:20; 2 Kgs 18:36 (=Isa 36:21); Isa 42:14; Jer 4:19; Pss 32:3; 50:21; Prv 11:12; 17:28.

31 Wellhausen (Die Composition des Hexateuchs, p. 124) uses this same argumentation for Josh 8:13.

Cross pointed out, a logical introduction to the story of the threat to Jabesh-Gilead. On the other hand, however, the Ammonites' motives in threatening the city may not necessarily have to be a part of the narrative since the whole episode, far from being central to the story, serves as the occasion for Saul to confirm his leadership after having been designated king in 10:20-24, and before the official recognition of his kingship by the people at Gilgal in 11:14 f. As such, the narrative originally may not have been interested in giving the historical background to the incident.

Within the plus, the designation בני גר and בני ראובן seems curiously anachronistic. Elsewhere in Samuel the names of the twelve tribes, preceded by בני occur only with בני בנימן (1 Sam 22:7; 2 Sam 2:25; 4:2; 23:29), and once with בני-יהודה (2 Sam 1:18). Even the use of בני ישראל is fairly infrequent in Sam.<sup>32</sup> That "the sons of Gad" and "the sons of Reuben" should crop up all of a sudden, and only in a disputed passage whose language is archaic (or designed on purpose to seem so) may be an indication that it does not belong with the rest of the narrative.

As far as the presence of the plus in Josephus is concerned, Cross' explanation of a vertical, anticipatory dittography and then an accident through homeoteleuton in Josephus' Vorlage, in addition to being extremely complicated, does not explain Josephus' form if one presumes the 4Q text to contain the original form. Josephus contains the month's interval (although in a different place than in 4Q), the Jews who had settled beyond the Jordan (= the sons of Gad and of Reuben, although he does not mention them by name), and the gouging out of their right eyes by Nahash the king of the Ammonites. He does not mention the seven thousand escapees, and so, in Josephus' account, the refuge provided by the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead does not constitute the motive for Nahash's attack on them. Further, it is impossible to see how a textual accident such as Cross describes for

32 1 Sam 2:28; 7:4.6.7.8; 10:18; 11:8; 14:8; 15:6; 17:53;  
2 Sam 7:6.7; 21:2 (ter).

Josephus' Vorlage could have separated the seven thousand from the rest of the account. If, as he says, ויהי כמו חדש had been erroneously inserted at the beginning of the paragraph and then the haplography occurred, the resultant text would resemble that of LXX, not that of Josephus.

The text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> contains a plus of a complete line at 1 Sam 11:9-10, only a few lines beyond our text here. Although its contents are irretrievable, given the state of the fragment, it is clear that the plus in 11:9-10 is found neither in MT nor in LXX.<sup>33</sup> 4QSam<sup>a</sup> seems clearly to witness to a textual tradition with expansionist tendencies and, considering the total absence of the plus of 10:27-11:1 in MT and LXX, plus the lectio difficilior which MT contains with ויהי כמחריש, it seems much more likely that 4Q has an expanded text here as well, part of whose tradition was shared by Josephus, and a smaller part of which was known to LXX, as far as the agreement on ויהי כמו חדש is concerned. Thus, the shorter and more difficult MT seems preferable here.

## 2 Sam 5:4 f.

MT: בן-שלשים שנה דוד במלכו ארבעים שנה מלך<sup>5</sup> בחברון מלך על-  
יהודה שבע שנים וששה חדשים ובירושלם מלך שלשים ושלש שנה  
על כל-ישראל ויהודה

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>4</sup> υιος τριακοντα ετων Δαυειδ εν τω βασιλευσαι αυτον,  
και τεσσαρακοντα ετη εβασιλευσεν. <sup>5</sup>επτα ετη και εξ  
μηνας εβασιλευσεν εν Χεβρων επι τον Ιουδα, και τρια-  
κοντα τρια ετη εβασιλευσεν επι παντα Ισραηλ και  
Ιουδαν εν Ιερουσαλημ.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: <sup>4</sup> τριακοντα ετων ην Δαυιδ εν τω βασιλευειν αυτον,  
και τεσσαρακοντα ετη εβασιλευσεν. <sup>5</sup>και εβασιλευσεν  
εν Χεβρων επι Ιουδαν ετη επτα και μηνας εξ, και εν  
Ιερουσαλημ εβασιλευσεν τριακοντα δυο ετη και μηνας  
εξ επι παντα Ισραηλ και Ιουδαν.

The notice of the length of David's reign, which occurs here in MT and in all Greek mss, is absent from OL<sup>b</sup>,<sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 133.

<sup>34</sup> OL<sup>b</sup> = J. Belsheim, Palimpsestus Vindobonensis (Christiania, 1855), cited in Brooke-McLean.

Josephus, 1 Chr and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.<sup>35</sup> While many commentators make no mention of these two verses,<sup>36</sup> Klostermann claimed that they were of later origin and were inserted here according to the plan of the books of Kings.<sup>37</sup> Budde placed them after 2 Sam 8:14, along with 3:2-5 and 5:13:16,<sup>38</sup> but this was objected to by Smith who, while he considered them a later addition, states that their proper place is nevertheless at the beginning of David's reign over Israel in 2 Sam 5.<sup>39</sup>

Hertzberg points out that "the placing of such a note at this point underlines the recognition of the historical significance of the moment,"<sup>40</sup> although he notes that the mention of Jerusalem shows that it did not originally belong here. Thenius had claimed that the absence of these verses from 1 Chr was due to a textual accident.<sup>41</sup>

Barthélemy upholds the originality of these two verses, noting however that their absence from OL is a sure sign that they were absent from the genuine OG as well, having been omitted out of the latter's desire for a more coherent and less problematic text. In the same way 4QSam<sup>a</sup> has omitted this information which is, in part, found elsewhere (cf. 2 Sam 2:11 and 1 Kgs 2:11), and which in MT for 5:5 does not add up correctly, forty years total reign being the sum of seven and a half plus thirty-three.<sup>42</sup>

Ulrich, on the other hand, maintains that, in addition to the original OG, 4Q, and Chr, the old Hebrew tradition lacked the plus as well. Then "the gloss was inserted into the M tradition and was subsequently reflected by T P and an early reviser of G. All subsequent G mss

---

35 Ulrich, QTSJ, pp. 60-62.

36 Keil, Erdmann, Wellhausen, Hummelauer, Driver, Ehrlich, Schulz.

37 Klostermann, p. 146.

38 Budde (SBOT). Cf. also Nowack.

39 Smith, p. 287, followed by Dhorme.

40 Hertzberg, p. 267.

41 Thenius<sup>2</sup>, p. 160.

42 Barthélemy, "La qualité...", pp. 17 f.

included this gloss the same way they included the early doublets and other revisions which are universally attested."<sup>43</sup>

As Barthélemy and Ulrich have both suggested, it seems most probable indeed that this plus was lacking in the original OG. Its absence from OL is hardly accountable for otherwise. The fact of its absence from Chr may, however, not necessarily be a sign that it was lacking in early Hebrew tradition. In 1 Chr 11, vv.1-9 follow 2 Sam 5:1-3.6-10. At 1 Chr 11:10-41, the list of David's chiefs which corresponds to 2 Sam 23:8-39 is inserted. Then at 1 Chr 13 the order of 2 Sam is resumed with the story of the entry of the ark into Jerusalem. Thus Chr has rearranged, edited and omitted material from Sam to fit its own needs and outlook. The notice of the length of David's reign occurs in 1 Chr 29:27, which corresponds to 1 Kgs 2:11, at the moment of David's death. Chr has preferred to put off the reckoning of the years of David's reign until it is finished, which is, in fact, a more logical place than in Sam. In both 1 Kgs 2:11 and 1 Chr 29:27, the arithmetic comes out just right -- seven years in Hebron and thirty-three in Jerusalem for a total of forty years. In 2 Sam 5:5, an extra six months is registered in the reign at Hebron, exactly the kind of precision which could easily be removed in a later text, for it is less probable that details which disturb the logic would be added rather than subtracted. Since OG translated Sam after the text of Chr was already in existence, it could easily have been influenced by the desire to make the calculations exact and by the more logical positioning of the tally of David's reign at the time of his death alone and not at the beginning of the Jerusalem period as in MT. 4Q seems to have followed the excised text, probably already in LXX's Vorlage, which, inspired by Chr, eliminated this notice from the place which it held in the pre-MT.

Several Greek mss have adjusted the figures here in order to make the calculations work out. For the length

---

<sup>43</sup> Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 62.

of David's reign in Jerusalem, mss b c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> have και εν Ιερουσαλημ εβασιλευσεν τριακοντα δυο ετη και μηνας εξ for MT הנה שש ושלשים חודשים. For 5:5b, ms o read simply και εβασιλευσεν επι παντα Ισραηλ και Ιουδαν, omitting the reference to Jerusalem as well as the length of his reign there. Ms a<sub>2</sub> reads και τεσσαρακοντα ετη εβασιλευσεν επι παντα Ισραηλ και Ιουδαν εν Ισραηλ, having chosen to drop the specific reference to Jerusalem and to repeat the total forty-year reign. These modifications appear to be attempts to make the difficult MT more exact and do not suggest a different Hebrew text.

The fact that MT is problematic makes it more likely that it is original here, and that the ancestor common both to OG and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> purposely omitted these two verses in order to remove both the difficulty in calculation and the less satisfactory placing of the sum of David's reign here, at the moment in which he begins to rule from Jerusalem.

## 2 Sam 6:2

MT: ויקם וילך דוד וכל-העם אשר אתו מבעלי יהודה להעלות משם את ארון האלהים...

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ανεστη και επορευθη Δαυειδ και πας ο λαος ο μετ' αυτου απο των αρχοντων Ιουδα εν αναβασει, του αναγαγειν εκειθεν την κιβωτον του θεου...

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ανεστη και επορευθη Δαυειδ και πας ο λαος ο μετ' αυτου απο των αρχοντων Ιουδα εν τη αναβασει του βουνου του αναγαγειν εκειθεν την κιβωτον του θεου...

4QSam<sup>a</sup>:<sup>44</sup> ... אתו בעלה היא קר[ת יערים אשר] ליהוה להעלות[ת]...

## 1 Chr 13:6

MT: ויעל דויד וכל-ישראל בעלת אל-קרית יערים אשר ליהודה להעלות משם את ארון האלהים יהוה...

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ανηγαγεν αυτην Δαυειδ και πας Ισραηλ ανεβη εις πολιν Δαυειδ, η ην του Ιουδα, του αναγαγειν εκειθεν την κιβωτον του θεου Κυριου...

When David and the people went to bring the ark of God to Jerusalem, LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> contain a small plus. The

<sup>44</sup> Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 194. The superimposed daleth is found as such in the ms.



The reading of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> agrees with both the parallel at 1 Chr 13:6 and Josephus (... εἰς Καριαθαριμα.<sup>45</sup>) in mentioning the other name of this location where the ark had been kept ever since it had been re-taken from the Philistines (1 Sam 6:21-7:2). That the city was known both as (Kiriath-) Baal and Kiriath-Jearim is clear from Josh 15:9.60; 18:14, which take the trouble to specify both names as in 1 Chr 13:6 and 4Q for 2 Sam 6:2. As it appears in 4Q, the name Baalah has been glossed with היא קריית יערים, and Ulrich agrees that the superior reading is the shorter, unglossed MT.<sup>46</sup>

Whether MT here is entirely in order is another question however. The MT clearly reads מבעלי יהודה, which LXX seems to have rendered doubly as απο των αρχωντων Ιουδα εν αναβασει.<sup>47</sup> Wellhausen suggested that the Greek here stems from a metathesis, the LXX having originally read במעלי. MT here, reflected in the correction made in Greek to απο των αρχωντων, would have come from a false understanding of יהודה, בעלי יהודה, the "burghers of Judah". He recommends striking the mem before בעלי and reading יהודה בעלי, as in Josh 15:9.<sup>48</sup> Virtually all commentators have followed him, the only variation being whether to read בעל,<sup>49</sup> בעלי,<sup>50</sup> בעלת<sup>51</sup> or בעלתה<sup>52</sup> as the city's name. Keil, following Kimchi, suggests that MT מבעלי might be original after all, and that the ancient historian mistakenly jumped ahead in his narrative so that he referred to Baal-Judah not as the

45 Ant. VII, 78.

46 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 197.

47 The only variant in the Greek mss is the addition of του βουβου in b i o z c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>.

48 Wellhausen, pp. 166 f.

49 Wellhausen, Nowack, Driver, Smith.

50 Ehrlich.

51 Budde, Dhorme, Schulz, Kittel.

52 Klostermann.

place to which David went with the men, but as the place from which they brought the ark.<sup>53</sup>

Vg here (ex viris Iuda) agrees with LXX's second translation while Syr (mn gbr' dyhwd' w'zl lgb<sup>c</sup>), in addition to containing "the men of Judah", appears to have been influenced by the Ant text, as its mention of Geba indicates. Tg, on the other hand, has provided its own interpretation here: מקרויא רבית יהודה.

The presence of מִשָּׁם in MT requires that a place name be indicated earlier in the verse and Wellhausen's correction to נְעֻלֵי יְהוּדָה provides a seemingly more logical text. If his explanation of the OG εν αναβασει as נְמַעֲלֵי is correct, however, this shows that the mem must have already been present in LXX's Vorlage,<sup>54</sup> which confirms that MT's reading is at least very old, if not original.

Likewise, if the mem stems from a misunderstanding of נְעֻלֵי יְהוּדָה as "the burghers of Judah", it must have been an early misunderstanding since by the time of the text of Chr, tradition had clearly established that a place name was indicated here, as 1 Chr 13:6 shows.

It is significant that LXX for 1 Chr 13:6 has rendered יַעֲרִים קִרְיָהּ אֶל-נְעֻלָּהּ as εις πολιν Δαυειδ,<sup>55</sup> which indicates that LXX for both Sam and Chr has avoided the

53 Keil, p. 239. Similarly, Hertzberg suggests that a first part of this verse, which would have described David's going to Baale-Judah, may have fallen out of the text (Hertzberg, p. 275).

54 Ulrich (QTSJ, p. 198) cites the original Hebrew text as נְעֻלָּה (ה) יְהוּדָה, which is possible, but the references he gives (Judg 11:13.16; 19:30; 1 Kgs 18:36) all reflect a verbal form of נְעֻלָּה. At 2 Sam 6:2, the LXX misreading of נְעֻלָּה (ה) seems to reflect rather נְעֻלָּה, such as is found at Num 34:4; Josh 10:10; 18:17; Judg 1:36; 8:13; 1 Sam 9:11; 2 Sam 15:30; 2 Chr 20:16; 32:33; Neh 9:4; 12:37; Isa 15:5, all of which are rendered as αναβασις in LXX.

55 The only exception being mss b e<sub>2</sub>, which have corrected to εις Καριαθαβημ.

proper name "Baal(ah)" here. It may be entirely coincidental, or it may indicate a dissatisfaction on the part of LXX that the city containing the ark should have been named Baal. If that is true, OG's metathesis which produced εν αναβασει may not have been entirely accidental.

MT's מִבְּעֵי יְהוּדָה represents certainly the more difficult reading for 2 Sam 6:2, while the texts of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and 1 Chr 13:6 contain a later gloss inspired most probably by Josh 15:9.60; 18:14. Whether MT contains simply a hurried narrative which speaks only of the place from which the ark was brought without specifying that David went to Baal-Judah, or whether a correction must be made according to the seeming logic of the narrative, it may be said at least that there is no textual basis for correcting the MT reading, which is surely an old one, as its indirect reflection in LXX's Vorlage indicates.

## 2 Sam 6:7

MT: ויחר-אף יהוה בעזה ויכהו שם האלהים על-השל וימת שם עם ארון האלהים

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και εθυμωθη Κυριος τω Οζα, και επαισεν αυτον εμει ο θεος, και απεθανεν εμει παρα την ενωπτωτον του Κυριου ενωπιον του θεου.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και εθυμωθη οργη Κυριος εν τω Οζα, και επαταξεν αυτον εμει ο θεος επι τη προπετεια, και απεθανεν εμει παρα την ενωπτωτον του Κυριου ενωπιον του θεου.

4QSam<sup>a</sup>:<sup>56</sup> ... [ו]יכהו שם האלהים [על-אשר שלח ידו] אל [ה]אֲרוֹן ל[פני הא]5[ו]י[ה]ים

## 1 Chr 13:10

MT: ויחר-אף יהוה בעזא ויכהו על אשר-שלח ידו על-הארון וימת שם לפני אלהים

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και εθυμωθη Κυριος επι Οζα, και επαταξεν αυτον εμει δια το εκτειναι την χειρα αυτου επι την ενωπτωτον· αμα απεθανεν εμει απεναντι του θεου.

When Uzzah was struck dead for touching the ark, MT contains the problematic על-השל, which is absent from

<sup>56</sup> Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 195.

cod B.<sup>57</sup> The hexaplaric and Ant texts read  $\epsilon\mu\iota\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\alpha$ , reflected in Vg super temeritate, although in Contra Pelag. Jerome rendered it as pro ignorantia,<sup>59</sup> while Aquila here read  $\epsilon\mu\iota\ \tau\eta\ \epsilon\kappa\upsilon\lambda\omicron\iota\alpha$ .<sup>60</sup> A part of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is missing here, but, as Ulrich shows in his reconstruction, there is enough space for reading with the parallel in 1 Chr 13:10 על-אשר שלח ידו על-הארון, which Syr seems to have followed for 2 Sam 6:7 ( $^c\text{1 d'wšṭ 'ydh}$ ).

The text of 1 Chr provides a good meaning with a plausible reason for Uzzah's unfortunate end -- that he stretched his hand out and touched the ark --, and a number of commentators correct 2 Sam on that basis.<sup>61</sup> If MT for Sam once originally contained על-אשר שלח ידו על הארון, however, it is difficult to see what kind of textual accident could have resulted in the present על-השל.<sup>62</sup> This reading in Chr rings more either of a different tradition or of an insertion designed to account for Uzzah's death where MT for Sam had become unintelligible.<sup>63</sup> Whatever the cause, however, it seems clear that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and 1 Chr show the same tradition here. Ulrich maintains that MT for Sam originally contained

57 Along with mss M N a d h j(txt) l n p q s t u v y a<sub>2</sub> b<sub>2</sub>. Ms z adds  $\epsilon\mu\iota\ \tau\eta\ \kappa\iota\beta\omega\tau\omega$ .

58 Mss A b c e f g i j(mg- sub X) m o w x c<sub>2</sub>(sub X) e<sub>2</sub>.

59 Contra Pelag., t.4, 508 f. (Cf. Sabatier).

60 Barthélemy notes that Aquila, Saadia, Abulwalid, Rashi Radak interpret של from the Aramaic meaning of the root שלה, "negligence, fault through inadvertence," (CTAT).

61 Thenius, Wellhausen, Budde, Nowack, Löhr, Driver, Kittel, Hertzberg, RSV.

62 For the meaning of השל, commentators suggest 1) "error" (Dhorme [1956], TOB, HOTTP); 2) "fault" (Keil, Osty, BJ); 3) "arrogance" (Eü); 4) "rash act" (NEB); 5) an original place name (Klostermann, Smith, Dhorme [1910]); 6) omit (NAB).

63 Barthélemy suggests that the "texte le plus coulant provienne d'un développement inspiré par le contenu du verset précédent" (CTAT).

the plus here and thus agreed with 4Q. The OG, on the other hand, "apparently lacked the plus, going back to an early, characteristically concise, Egyptian Hebrew text."<sup>64</sup>

Josephus' text contained the plus as well,<sup>65</sup> although it is not clear whether he derived it from the text of Sam or from Chr. At 6:10, David deposits the ark in the house of Obed-edom the Gittite. Josephus (Ant.VI, 83) adds that he was a Levite by descent, a detail unknown in Sam but found in 1 Chr 15:18. Since Josephus seems to have drawn on both sources for his information, his inclusion of the plus that "Uzzah stretched out his hand" may have come from Chr as well.

It is possible that OG may have simply omitted לַהֲשִׁיב out of desperation, not being able to understand what it might refer to. If such was the case, then its Vorlage would have been close to MT here. We have seen at 2 Sam 8:7-8 that OG or its Vorlage knew of the text of Chr and used it in its own text. It could, therefore, have modified its text here according to Chr if it had wished to do so. In any event, the absence of a translation of לַהֲשִׁיב shows a LXX Vorlage which was either similar to MT or which lacked the words altogether, as Ulrich suggests.

The reading in MT here is either irretrievably corrupt or else the meaning of the word has become unintelligible. Because of the difficulty in seeing how it could be a corruption of the longer text of 1 Chr and 4Q, which appears rather to be an expansion, MT seems to witness here to the older form of the text.

---

<sup>64</sup> Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 205. Ulrich places this reading under the formula J=4Q C ≠ M G (p. 179), but if his analysis is correct it should be J=4Q C ≠ M ≠ G.

<sup>65</sup> Ant. VII, 82.

2 Sam 10:6 f.

MT: <sup>6</sup>ויראו בני עמון כי נבאשי בדוד וישלחו בני-עמון וישכרו את-  
 ארם בית-רחוב ואת-ארם צובא עשרים אלף רגלי ואת-מלך מעכה  
 אלף איש ואיש טוב שנים-עשר אלף איש <sup>7</sup>וישמע דוד וישלח את-  
 יואב ואת כל-הצבא הגברים

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>6</sup>και ειδαν οι υιοι Αμμων οτι κατησχυνθησαν ο λαος  
 Δαυειδ· και απεστειλαν οι υιοι Αμμων και εμισθωσαντο  
 την Συριαν και Ρωβ, εικοσι χιλιαδας πεζων, και τον  
 βασιλεα Αμαληκ, χιλιους ανδρας, και Ειστωβ, δωδεκα  
 χιλιαδας ανδρων. <sup>7</sup>και ηκουσεν Δαυειδ, και απεστειλεν  
 τον Ιωαβ και πασαν την δυναμιν, τους δυνατους.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: <sup>6</sup>και ειδον οι υιοι Αμμων οτι ησχυνθησαν οι δουλοι  
 Δαυιδ, και αποστελλουσιν οι υιοι Αμμων και μισθουνται  
 τον Συρον και Βαιθραβ και τον Συρον Σουβα, εικοσι  
 χιλιαδας πεζων, και τον βασιλεα Μααχα, χιλιους ανδρας,  
 και τον Ιστωβ, δωδεκα χιλιαδας ανδρων. <sup>7</sup>και ηκουσεν  
 Δαυιδ, και απεστειλεν τον Ιωαβ και πασαν την στρατιαν  
 των δυνατων.

4QSam<sup>a</sup>:<sup>66</sup>

בני עמון]	אלף כָּר כסָּ	]
ומצנב] ה רכב ופרשים	לשכור להם מן ארם נהרים ומן ארם מ]	
[ואת מלך מעכה וא]	שנים שלוש] אֵלף רכָּ	?
שטוב	ובני] עמון נאספו מן ה[עדים	
δ[	וישמע דוד וישלח את-יואב ואת כל-	

1 Chr 19:6-8

MT: <sup>6</sup>ויראו בני עמון כי התבאשו עם-דוד וישלח חנון ובני עמון  
 אלף ככר-כסף לשכר להם מן-ארם נהרים ומן-ארם מעכה ומצובה  
 רכב ופרשים <sup>7</sup>וישכרו להם שנים ושלשים אלף רכב ואת-מלך  
 מעכה ואת-עמו ויבאו ויחנו לפני מידבא ובני עמון נאספו  
 מעריהם ויבאו למלחמה <sup>8</sup>וישמע דוד וישלח את-יואב ואת כל-  
 צבא הגבורים

This text has been aptly termed by Ulrich a  
 "glossator's carnival", for a comparison shows that of all  
 the texts given above, plus that of Josephus as we shall see,  
 no two are exactly alike for these verses which describe the  
 Ammonites' hiring of armies to help them fight against David.

Beginning with MT and LXX, we note that, while they  
 are not identical, these texts are strikingly similar. Both  
 cod B and Ant have expressed a subject for MT נבאשו, although  
 the two Greek text traditions differ on a number of points,  
 as the following comparison indicates:

<u>MT</u>	<u>Cod B</u>	<u>Ant</u>
נבאשו בדוד	κατησχυνθυσαν ο λαος Δαυειδ	ησχυνθησαν οι δουλοι Δαυειδ
את ארם בית-רחוב ואת-ארם צובא	την Συριαν και Ρωβ	τον Συρον και Βαιθ- ρααβ <sup>67</sup> και τον Συρον Σουβα
מעכה	Αμαληκ	Μααχα
כל-הצבא הגברים	πασαν την δυμαμιν τους δυνατους	πασαν την στρατιαν των δυνατων

Note that at each of these points, Ant is closer to MT than is B, which speaks against cod B containing the kaigé recension here.<sup>68</sup> There is no reason for not considering cod B to contain the more original Greek text here, with Ant showing a correction toward MT.

Before the Qumran material was known, many authors already sought an emendation of the words אִישׁ וְאִישׁ טוֹב אֶלֶף. Wellhausen, noting that a thousand men appeared to be a small contingent for Maacah to have sent, recommended omitting אִישׁ אֶלֶף altogether, thus placing Maacah and Ishtob together.<sup>69</sup> The figures then agree with the 32,000 men in the parallel in 1 Chr 19:7. Budde goes further in omitting the waw before Ishtob, thus making it the proper name of "the king of Maacah."<sup>70</sup> Dhorme, in addition to accepting Wellhausen's correction, eliminates וְאִישׁ as a dittograph, reading the place name וטוב and identifying it with Et-

67 Sic Lagarde, although this form is found only in ms N. In the usual Ant mss, we find b\* βεθρααβ, b'b<sup>a</sup>? βεθρααμ, c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> βαιθρααμ, and o\* βαιρααμ.

68 Against Ulrich, who writes, "As we examine the Greek text of Samuel, we notice that it falls within the area considered by Shenkel to have undergone KR revision, and we notice that it clings very closely to M" (QTSJ, p. 154).

69 Wellhausen, p. 179. He notes the similarity between this case and 1 Sam 13:1 and 2 Sam 2:10 where the figures given seem erroneous as well.

70 Budde (KHAT), p. 248.

Tayihe.<sup>71</sup> Klostermann proposed ואת מלך מעכה את איש טוב ועמו, based partially on Wellhausen and partially on a correction from Chr (וְעָמוֹ).<sup>72</sup> Ehrlich maintained that some figure designating how many thousand men had fallen out of the text.<sup>73</sup> Driver noted that אלף איש is "out of construction", and prefixed waw -- a "waw of concomitance" --, pointing out that Wellhausen's omission of אלף איש "leads to fresh difficulties and improbabilities in connexion with איש טוב."<sup>74</sup> Many, however, find no sufficient reason for departing from the text and read with MT.<sup>75</sup> All the aforementioned suggestions for emendation fail to mention that in this verse all the Greek mss agree with MT's apparently problematic reading, which is a sign that it is at least a very old text.

With the discovery of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, a text has been brought to light which agrees very closely with the parallel at 1 Chr 19:6-8 -- a text, however, which departs dramatically from MT and LXX for 2 Sam here. 4Q and Chr agree on the sum of a thousand talents of silver paid by the Ammonites, on the mention of horsemen and chariots rather than foot soldiers, and on the names of the kings and places from which the soldiers were hired. As Ulrich's reconstruction shows, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> appears to follow 1 Chr word for word with the exception of its agreement with MT for וְאִישׁ טוֹב in place of 1 Chr וְאֶת-עָמוֹ.<sup>76</sup> Ulrich judiciously observes that "from this

71 Dhorme (1910), p. 349.

72 Klostermann, p. 171.

73 Ehrlich, p. 294.

74 Driver, p. 288.

75 Keil, Erdmann, Hertzberg, BJ, Dhorme (1956), Osty, TOB, RSV, NEB, NAB.

76 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 152. Note, however, three uncertain points in 4Q which contain unaccountably long spaces 1) after מעכה; 2) the beginning of the line preceding שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר; 3) at the beginning of the line, preceding וַיִּשְׁמַע. The text of Chr is not long enough to fill these spaces, but conjecture on their contents is impossible.



specific text in isolation it cannot be proved either that 4Q is a conflation of M and C or that C is dependent on 4Q."<sup>77</sup>

In the text of Josephus here, we find a mixture of material, some of which is closer to MT and some to 4Q/Chr:

και πεμφαντες προς Συρον τον των Μεσοποταμιτων βασιλεα χιλια ταλαντα συμμαχον αυτον επι τουτω γενεσθαι τω μισθω παρεκαλεσαν και Σουβαν' ησαν δε τοις βασιλευσι τουτοις πεζου δυο μυριαδες. προσεμισθωσαντο δε και τον εκ της Μιχας καλου-μενης χωρας βασιλεα και τεταρτον Ιστοβον ονομα, και τουτους εχοντας μυριους και δισχιλιους οπλι-τας.<sup>78</sup>

Thus, 4Q, Chr and Josephus agree on the thousand talents of silver, on the mention of Mesopotamia, and on the total of 32,000 soldiers, but Josephus agrees with MT and LXX on the mention of foot soldiers rather than horsemen and chariots.

Ulrich maintains that the absence of χιλίους ανδρας in connection with Maacah's forces shows agreement between Josephus and "OG/pL". Further, מֵשֶׁכֶּת, found in 4Q as well, was definitely present in OG's Hebrew Vorlage and was rendered Ειστωβ in OG. The kaigé recension took this over from OG "because it was not a clear corrigendum relative to the proto-M ms." מֵשֶׁכֶּת, on the other hand, which was in MT but not in OG's Vorlage, was rendered χιλίους ανδρας in kaigé. The fact that Josephus has the former (Ιστοβον) but not the latter shows that he followed OG, which was ultimately dependent on 4Q, but not kaigé, which depended on MT. Also, Josephus' total of the men, 20,000 plus 12,000, rules out the 1,000 men of Maacah.<sup>79</sup>

Ulrich's reasoning, however, is difficult to follow here. The term χιλίους ανδρας is found in all mss of Brooke-McLean without exception. Further, as shown above, the text of Ant (mss b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>) is consistently closer to MT than is cod B, so there is no evidence that cod B, where the kaigé

<sup>77</sup> Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 154.

<sup>78</sup> Ant. VII, 121.

<sup>79</sup> Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 155.

should appear, contains a recension corrected in favor of MT in this case.

While Josephus does not include the thousand men of Maacah's forces, he appears to be the only one to speak of exactly 32,000 men in the army raised by the Ammonites. MT and LXX clearly have 33,000 (20,000 + 1,000 + 12,000). Chr speaks of 32,000 chariots and horses, raised from Mesopotamia, Aram-maacah and Zobah, and then adds, "and the king of Maacah with his men." According to the Chr text, they seem not to have been included in the 32,000. 4Q, according to Ulrich's reconstruction, followed Chr as far as indicating the 32,000 chariots and horses from the three places. Then, after this, it adds, "and King Maacah [and I]shtob..." Here, therefore, just as in Chr, Maacah and Ishtob seem not to be included in the 32,000 by their position in the sentence. If Josephus' Greek Biblical text of Sam read as LXX and contained the 20,000 + 1,000 + 12,000, and if he had compared this with Chr's 32,000 plus the unspecified men of Maacah (and of Ishtob if he had 4Q's text before him), he could have easily fitted his count to arrive at Chr's 32,000, simply by dropping Maacah's force, which was unspecified in Chr anyway, and by grouping him with Ishtob. Josephus' division of the troops, rather than the lump sum as found in 4Q/Chr, plus the silence about the chariots and horses, makes it possible that his principal source was a Greek text similar to our LXX mss, although he knew of Chr's text as well. Because of the lacuna in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> at יִשְׁטוֹב [מַעַכָּה וְאִיִּשְׁטוֹב], it is not possible to tell whether Ishtob is meant to be a separate person, as in Josephus, or the proper name of the king of Maacah. It is, thus, not clear how much Josephus depended on a 4Q-type tradition. This is not to say that Ulrich is necessarily wrong, but rather that another explanation is possible here, and the lack of certainty in the 4Q reading must leave the question open.

4Q, in any event, shares clearly a large part of its reading with the Chr tradition. Kittel attributed the

different names in Chr not to an independent tradition, but to the fact that in the time of the Chronicler these places were known by different names, so that he could no longer recognize which places were meant in the MT 2 Sam text.<sup>80</sup> He notes further that, whereas Chr speaks of 32,000 chariots, Sam's 32,000 foot soldiers was closer to the historical situation.<sup>81</sup>

Thus, for these variants between MT/LXX and 4Q/Chr the agreement of MT and LXX must certainly be taken into account in determining the age and priority of this common tradition in MT/LXX. Josephus seems to have known of both and combined the material from 2 Sam and from Chr (or from a text of Sam which was similar to Chr). 4Q and Chr contain a text which has modified and enlarged upon that of the more primitive one witnessed in MT/LXX.

## 2 Sam 24:16b-17a

MT: ומלאך יהוה היה עם-גרון האורנה היבסי<sup>17a</sup> ויאמר דוד אל-יהוה<sup>16b</sup>

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>16b</sup> και ο αγγελος Κυριου ην παρα τω αλω Ορνα του Ιεβουσαιου. <sup>17a</sup> και ειπεν Δαυειδ προς Κυριον...

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: <sup>16b</sup> και ο αγγελος του θεου ην εστηκως παρα την αλω Ορνα του Ιεβουσαιου. <sup>17a</sup> και ειπεν Δαυιδ προς Κυριον...

4QSam<sup>a</sup>:<sup>82</sup> [ומלאך י] הוה עומד ע[ם גרון א] ונא ה[יבסי וישא] [דויד] [את עיניו... בין] הארץ ובין [הש] [י]ם וחר[ב] ושלופה בידו [נטויה] [על ירושלים... והזקנים על פנ] יהם מת[ס]ים ב[שקים ויאמר דוד אל יהוה]

## 1 Chr 21:15b-17a

MT: ומלאך יהוה עמד עם-גרון ארנן היבסי<sup>16</sup> וישא דויד את-עיניו וירא את-מלאך יהוה עמד בין הארץ ובין השמים וחרבו שלופה בידו נטויה על-ירושלם ויפל דויד והזקנים מכסים בשקים על-פניהם<sup>17</sup> ויאמר דויד אל-האלהים

At the end of 2 Sam 24:16, the text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> contains a plus describing the angel standing by the threshing

80 R. Kittel, Die Bücher der Chronik (Göttingen, 1902), pp. 76 f.

81 Kittel, Chronik, p. 77.

82 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 156.

floor of Araunah with sword drawn, and David and the elders in sackcloth, fallen upon their faces. The plus parallels the text of 1 Chr 21:15-16 and is found in Josephus as well,<sup>83</sup> but is absent from both MT and LXX in 2 Sam.

Ulrich attributes the loss of these two lines from MT to an accident through haplography (homeoarcton) at *וישאר...וישמר*, and its absence from LXX to a revision which would have excised the section because it was not present in MT.<sup>84</sup>

Indications that 4Q is not dependent upon Chr here include: 1) the correct name of Orna in 4Q against both MT (האורנה) and Chr (ארנן); 2) Chr's transposition of *מחכים מחכים* (על פניהם/נשקנם); 3) the hithpael *מחכים* against hophal *מכים* in Chr; and 4) 4Q's agreement with MT and LXX for *אל יהיה* against Chr *אל האלהים*.<sup>85</sup>

Barthélemy has reacted against Ulrich's analysis here, maintaining that, while 4Q does preserve a more primitive text vis-à-vis 1 Chr, both 4Q and 1 Chr include a paraphrase in the style of apocalyptic and post-exilic visions.<sup>86</sup> Further, there is simply no proof that the plus was once present in OG and that it had been excised. The pluses of OG at 2 Sam 24:13.15 which have been maintained in the Palestinian recension are sufficient to show that an excision is highly improbable here. Finally, a case of homeoarcton here, based on *וישמר...ויאמר*, is unlikely.<sup>87</sup>

To these observations it may be added that the presence of this plus in Josephus does not necessarily require that it have once been part of the early Sam text,

83 Ant. VII, 327: ο δε Βασιλεὺς σακκὸν ενδεδυμενός ἐκειτο κατὰ τῆς γῆς... αναβλεψας δ' εἰς τὸν αἶρα ο βασιλεὺς καὶ θεασαμενός τὸν ἀγγελὸν δι' αὐτοῦ φερόμενον ἐπὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ μαχαίραν ἐσπασμενον εἶπε πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

84 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 157.

85 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 157.

86 Barthélemy, CTAT.

87 Barthélemy, CTAT.

as Josephus does not hesitate to mix elements from Chr (or from the later, glossed text of Sam witnessed by 4Q) into his narrative, as we have already seen above.<sup>88</sup>

For these verses, therefore, 4Q contains a later addition to the text which agrees with Chr, but which was not necessarily part of the older text of Sam as contained in MT.

## 2 Sam 24:20

MT: וִירָא אֶת-הַמֶּלֶךְ וְאֶת-עַבְדָּיו עֹבְרִים עָלָיו וַיֵּצֵא אֲרוֹנָה וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה  
לְמֶלֶךְ אֲפִיו אֲרָצָה

LXX<sup>B</sup>: ...και ειδεν τον βασιλεα και τους παιδας αυτου παρα-  
πορευομενους επανω αυτου (διαπορευομενους επ'αυτον-  
Ant). και εξηλθεν Ορνα και προσεκυνησεν τω βασιλει επι  
προσωπον αυτου επι την γην.

4QSam<sup>a</sup>: 89 וִירָא אֶת הַמֶּלֶךְ וְאֶת עַבְדָּיו עֹבְרִים עָלָיו מִתְכַּסִּים בְּשָׂקִים  
וְאֲרָנָה דֵּשׁ חִטִּים

## 1 Chr 21:20

MT: וִירָא אֶת-הַמֶּלֶךְ וְאֶת עַבְדָּיו עֹבְרִים עָלָיו וַיֵּצֵא אֲרוֹנָה וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה  
לְמֶלֶךְ אֲפִיו אֲרָצָה

LXX<sup>B</sup>: ...και ειδεν τον βασιλεα και τεσσαρας υιους αυτου  
μετ'αυτου μεθαχαβειν' και Ορνα ην αλωων πυρους.

When Araunah sees David coming toward him, the texts of 2 Sam MT, LXX and 4Q, as well as the parallel at 1 Chr MT and LXX and Josephus,<sup>90</sup> each read slightly differently. 4Q agree with LXX and with 1 Chr and Josephus that Araunah was "threshing wheat" when David arrived. 4Q adds however, that David and his men were wearing sackcloth. MT for 1 Chr reports that Araunah saw an angel rather than the king while LXX for 1 Chr agrees with the rest of the texts of 2 Sam on that point.<sup>91</sup> Where 2 Sam reports the servants of the king approaching, Chr (both MT and LXX)

<sup>88</sup> Cf. p. 106 above.

<sup>89</sup> Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 157.

<sup>90</sup> Ant. VII, 330: Ορωννας δε τον σιτον αλωων επει τον βασιλεα προσιοντα και τους παιδας αυτου παντας εθεασατο.

<sup>91</sup> At 1 Chr 21:20, ms p<sup>b</sup> alone reads αγγελον here.

says that Araunah's four sons were hiding themselves. Josephus, on the other hand, contains neither the mention of the angel nor the four sons of Araunah.

The angel mentioned in 1 Chr here may be a corruption (המלאך for המלך), but is more likely a deliberate modification of the text since the angel turns up in 1 Chr 21:27.30 as well. LXX for 1 Chr 21:20 has "corrected" its text, reading τοὺς βασιλεῖς here, but left the four sons in place, which no longer makes sense without the presence of the angel. Curtis has pointed out that "the Chronicler desired to add more witnesses to the presence of the angel at this spot, since this fact consecrated the Temple site."<sup>92</sup>

In 4QSam<sup>a</sup> here, נשקים [מחכים] attests to an independent tradition carried only in 4Q. The wearing of the sackcloth by David and his men is mentioned already in 4Q 2 Sam 24:16 and appears again in the line following 24:20.<sup>93</sup>

Thus both 4Q and Chr witness to separate traditions of this scene. 4Q, Chr and Josephus agree, however, on the plus which says that Araunah was threshing wheat when David came along. Even before the discovery of 4Q, a large number of commentators recommended the insertion of this note into the text of Samuel.<sup>94</sup> Curtis, however, noted that this phrase "appears to have been introduced by the Chronicler in view of the following statement of v.21, 'and Ornan went out from the threshing floor'."<sup>95</sup> There is no occasion for a textual accident in MT for 2 Sam here which would account for its absence from the text, nor any apparent reason why MT would have excised the plus deliberately. On the other hand, it does harmonize the narrative, setting the scene

---

92 E. L. Curtis and A. A. Madsen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles (Edinburgh, 1910), p. 253.

93 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 158.

94 Thenius, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Budde, Smith, Nowack, Dhorme (1910), Kittel, Hertzberg, NAB, BJ.

95 Curtis, Chronicles, p. 252.

nicely for David's encounter with Araunah and the subsequent purchasing of the threshing floor.

As far as this text of 2 Sam is concerned, each stage seems to have added something. The text of MT is the shortest, without the note that Araunah was threshing wheat. It is more sober than 4Q and Chr, mentioning neither the sackcloth nor the angel and Araunah's four boys. Thus, MT is to be preferred as the more primitive state of the text, to which the additional information was appended.

### Conclusions

In these cases, which include one MT plus (2 Sam 5:4-5) and six MT minuses vis-à-vis 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, the text of 4Q shows a great resemblance to 1 Chr against both MT and LXX for Sam, except for the 4Q minus at 2 Sam 5:4-5 (shared by LXX and 1 Chr) and for 4Q's unique plus at 1 Sam 10:27-11:1. Ulrich has shown the difficulty in establishing priority between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and 1 Chr, although he observes that "the 4Q C agreements are mostly original S readings corrupt in M, or narrative expansions typical of the Palestinian text tradition," and "none of the 4Q C agreements either betrays characteristics commonly associated with the Chronicler's specific interests (levitical, genealogical, cultic, etc.) or displays new types of variation from M due to the fact that C now provides a parallel," to conclude that "this combination of observations points to the Samuel tradition, not the Chronicles tradition, as the source of the 4Q C similarity,"<sup>96</sup> and that "the contribution of 4Q is that it provides us with an exemplar much closer than M to the Samuel textual basis used by the Chronicler."<sup>97</sup> The few pluses which we have considered here bear this out well.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 163.

<sup>97</sup> Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 164.

<sup>98</sup> Note, however, that not one of these pluses agrees verbatim with 1 Chr.

Perhaps the most significant factor with regard to these pluses, however, is their disagreement with OG as well as with MT. Ulrich suggests that this might be due to excision of the pluses in later Greek revision when they were not found in MT (and then, presumably, subsequent contamination of even the most faithful OG mss),<sup>99</sup> although the likelihood of such a process is lessened if one considers the large number of instances in Sam where the OG text has been preserved intact despite its divergence from MT. The fact that Ulrich recognizes that some of the 4Q C agreements are "narrative expansions typical of the Palestinian text tradition" suggests the explanation for these pluses which we have considered. Their absence from the combined MT/LXX traditions is a powerful argument against their originality in the text of Sam. The fact that we are dealing, in each case but that of 2 Sam 5:4-5, with a plus in 4Q, and that none of the cases presents the occasion for a likely textual accident which would account for its omission in MT, suggest that 4Q's tradition has expanded an originally shorter text.

The large 4Q plus at 1 Sam 10:27-11:1, shared in its entirety by no other known text, appears again to be a sign of later expansion.

In the one plus here which MT contains over against 4Q, at 2 Sam 5:4-5, we saw that its presence in the text is more problematic than its absence because of the apparently faulty arithmetic and of its position at the beginning of a new stage of David's activity rather than at the end of his life where it would be expected. The fact that it is "problematic" is an indication of its originality rather than its being a later addition. This is the only one of the cases examined in this section for which 4Q agrees completely with OG, and the tradition which LXX and 4Q partially share could well have excised it from the text in the name of greater coherence.

---

99 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 157.



The result of the examination of these texts is that where there is a significant plus or minus in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> vis-à-vis MT, MT attests both to the same absence of literary activity that it did when compared with LXX, and to the retention of a difficult reading which was probably removed at a later date. MT, therefore, appears consistently to be the witness of a more primitive form of the text as far as these pluses and minuses are concerned.

#### 1.4 Double translations in LXX

In the following texts, LXX contains a plus in the form of a double reading which indicates a second or alternate translation vis-à-vis MT, or a different Vorlage.

##### 1 Sam 2:24

MT: אל בני כי לוא טובה השמעה אשר אנכי שמע מעברים עם-יהוה

LXX<sup>B</sup>: μη, τεκνα, οτι ουκ αγαθη η ακοη ην εγω ακουω· μη ποιειτε ουτως, οτι ουκ αγαθαι αι ακοαι ας εγω ακουω, του μη δουλευειν λαον θεω.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: μη, τεκνα, μη ποιειτε ουτως, οτι ουκ αγαθη η ακοη ην εγω ακουω περι υμων, του ποιειν τον λαον μη λατρευειν τω Κυρω.

4QSam<sup>a</sup>:<sup>1</sup> [ אל בני כי לוא טובה השמעה אשר אנכי שומע אל ]  
[ תעשון כן כי לוא טובות השמועות אשר אני שומע מעב ]

In this verse, cod B contains a plus, absent from Ant and omitted by Cappel.<sup>2</sup> Wellhausen identified the genuine OG text as beginning with μη ποιειτε ουτως and described all that preceded it as a double translation conforming to MT.<sup>3</sup> The majority of authors either takes no notice of the LXX plus here,<sup>4</sup> or reads with MT.<sup>5</sup> Peters alone suggested the complete reintegration of the repetitive plus into the original text, on the grounds that it expressed the loquaciousness of the time, and attributed its absence in MT to homeoteleuton at אשר אנכי שמע.<sup>6</sup> McCarter blames

1 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 41.

2 Cappel, Notae Criticae, p. 431.

3 Wellhausen, p. 47.

4 Thenius, Keil, Erdmann, Driver, Hummelauer, Budde, Smith, Dhorme, Ehrlich, Kittel, Stoebe, Hertzberg, RSV, NEB, BJ, Osty, TOB, EÜ.

5 Fernandez, Schulz.

6 Peters, p. 119.

the loss on haplography as well, but recognizes that the text of B, and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> which appears to follow it exactly, are conflate (as was, according to him, MT before the textual accident).<sup>7</sup> Ulrich, on the other hand, maintains that "in general M preserves the preferable short text."<sup>8</sup>

The fact that LXX<sup>B</sup> and 4Q agree here on the longer double text indicates that there was a common ancestor for this reading, but it is not necessary, as McCarter maintains, that it was so in the proto-MT as well. It is much more likely that the Vorlage of LXX contained a different reading here. In v.23, for MT למה תעשון כדברים האלה OG has the singular: Ἰνα τι ποιείτε κατα το ρημα τουτο (τα ρηματα ταυτα in b i o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>), and for MT את-דברים רעים מאד כל-העם אלה it reads: ἐκ στοματος παντος του λαου Κυριου (καταλαλουμενα καθ' υμων in b i o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>). This suggests that for v.24 as well, LXX's Vorlage was different from MT and that it was preserved in OG.<sup>9</sup>

The text of 4Q for these verses is somewhat problematic. The MT plus at v.22 is absent from it as from LXX. For v.23, Ulrich reconstructs the following reading for 4Q: [תעשון כדברים האלה] א[ש]י אני [שון]ע[נ]דב<sup>10</sup>, which appears to agree at least partially with MT against LXX. This is seen in the presence of דבר[ ] where LXX has ἐκ στοματος, although there is apparently not enough room in 4Q for the full MT את דבריכם רעים. There is room, however, for either the text of cod A (ρηματα πονηρα = דברים רעים), or that of Ant (καταλαλουμενα καθ' υμων = מודברים בכם)<sup>11</sup> but in either case LXX's ἐκ στοματος would no longer appear to fit. At v.24, 4Q contains the longer conflate text of LXX, although both Cross and Ulrich are in agreement that the text of MT is superior here.<sup>12</sup>

7 McCarter, p. 81.

8 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 42.

9 Klostermann, p. 8, calls the plus at v.24 a gloss.

10 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 41.

11 Cross, BASOR 132, p. 22.

12 Cross, BASOR 132, p. 23; Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 42.

Because of the presence of the double reading of v.24 in 4Q, it is likely that it was found already in LXX's Vorlage. That the text of MT is the more original, however, is suggested by its elliptical אל בני, whereas LXX אל-בני could have been influenced by the בני of v.23. This shorter MT expression, although not common, is sufficient as it stands, as Ruth 1:13 (אל בני כי) indicates.<sup>13</sup>

Here at 2:24, therefore, we have a double reading in LXX (and 4Q), which contains a more original MT reading followed by an alternate reading which was most likely found already in LXX's Vorlage.

# 1 Sam 4:14-16

MT: וישמע עלי את-קול הצלחה ויאמר מה קול ההמון הזה והאיש מהר ויבא ויגד לעלי<sup>15</sup> ועלי בני-תשעים ושמנה שנה ועיניו קמה ולא יכול לראות<sup>16</sup> ויאמר האיש אל-עלי אנכי הבא מן-המערכה ואני מן-המערכה נסתי היום ויאמר מה-היה הדבר בני

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>14</sup> και ηκουσεν Ηλει την φωνην της βοης και ειπεν Τις η βοη της φωνης ταυτης; και ο ανθρωπος σπευσας εισηλθεν και απηγγειλεν τω Ηλει. <sup>15</sup> και Ηλει υιος ενενηκοντα ετων, και οι οφθαλμοι αυτου επανεστησαν και ουκ εβλεπεν· και ειπεν Ηλει τοις ανδρασιν τοις περιεστηκοσιν αυτω Τις η φωνη του ηχους τουτου; <sup>16</sup> και ο ανηρ σπευσας προσηλθεν Ηλει και ειπεν αυτω Εγω ειμι ο ηκων εκ της παρεμβολης, καγω πεφευγα εκ της παραταξεως σημερον. και ειπεν Τι το γεγονας ρημα, τεκνον;

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: <sup>14</sup> και ηκουσεν Ηλει την βοην της φωνης και ειπεν Τις η φωνη της ακοης ταυτης; και ο ανθρωπος σπευσας εισηλθεν και απηγγειλεν τω Ηλει. <sup>15</sup> και Ηλει υιος ενενηκοντα και οκτω ετων, και οι οφθαλμοι αυτου εβασυνθησαν, και ουκ εβλεπεν. και ειπεν Ηλει τοις ανδρασιν τοις παρεστηκοσιν αυτω Τις η φωνη του ηχου τουτου; <sup>16</sup> και απεκριθη ο ανηρ ο εληλυθως και ειπεν εγω ειμι ο ηκων εκ της παρεμβολης· εγω πεφευγα εκ της παραταξεως σημερον, και ειπεν αυτω Ηλει Τι το γεγονος ρημα, τεκνον; απαγγειλον μοι, τεκνον.

In these verses, Eli's question about the tumult of the crowd appears, in a slightly different form, in vv. 14 and 15 in LXX. Thenius, in his first edition, called the

<sup>13</sup> Although the more usual form is אל plus vocative, followed by a negative command. Cf. 2 Sam 13:12.25; 2 Kgs 4:16; Judg 19:23.

sentence  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu\ \eta\lambda\epsilon\iota$  --  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$  (cod B) a "second translation of v.14 according to another text in which v.15 was lacking,"<sup>14</sup> and accordingly inserted  $\text{לֹא־נִשְׁתָּם הַנֹּצְבִים עָלָיו}$  and read  $\text{וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ וַיִּבֶּא אֶל-עָלִי}$  with LXX in place of MT  $\text{וַיִּבֶּא עָלָי}$  (v.14) and  $\text{וַיֹּאמֶר הָאִישׁ אֶל-עָלִי}$  (v.16), although in his second edition he retained only the first of these corrections.<sup>15</sup> Wellhausen identified LXX vv.14-15 as a doublet to vv.15b-16a, called the second of these the original OG, and maintained that the LXX originally lacked v.15, i.e., the reference to Eli's age and blindness, through a textual accident.<sup>16</sup> Klostermann, noting the close connection between Eli's question in v.14 and the messenger's answer in v.16, claimed that, since the information in v.15 is necessary, its original place was immediately after  $\text{הַצֶּעֱקָה}$  in v.14, but a later scribe placed it before the second  $\text{וַיֹּאמֶר}$  (v.16) instead of before the first in v.14. This then occasioned the insertion of  $\text{וַיִּבֶּא אֶל-עָלִי}$  to avoid confusion over the subject of  $\text{וַיֹּאמֶר}$ . He then, as Thenius, inserts  $\text{וַיִּבֶּא אֶל-הַנֹּצְבִים עָלָיו}$ .<sup>17</sup> Budde, who in SBOT omitted v.15 as an addition to the text, later replaced it in KHAT, claiming that LXX had purposely omitted it because of the reference to Eli's "keeping watch" in v.13. While agreeing that LXX v.15b contains the original Greek, he calls  $\text{τοὺς ἀνδράσιν}$  etc. an explanatory addition.<sup>18</sup> Smith observed that v.15, which interrupts the narrative, is "apparently a redactional

<sup>14</sup> Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 18.

<sup>15</sup> Thenius<sup>2</sup>, p. 20. Dhorme accepted only this change in MT (1910, p. 49), but abandoned it in 1956 to read totally with MT.

<sup>16</sup> Wellhausen, p. 56, followed by Nowack and Peters.

<sup>17</sup> Klostermann, p. 15. Both he and Thenius justify the mention of the "men standing around" by reference to v.20. There, however, it refers to the women attending the wife of Phinehas as she is dying in childbirth. This reference hardly seems compelling as a justification for vv.14 f., and its similarity makes it suspect.

<sup>18</sup> Budde (SBOT), p. 56; (KHAT), p. 36.

insertion," but suggested no other change in the text.<sup>19</sup> Stoebe suggests that the plus in LXX goes back to its Hebrew Vorlage,<sup>20</sup> and McCarter advanced the theory that the double text is due to a conflate reading that was present in the proto-MT as well, but through haplography at וַיֹּאמֶר and the expansion of וַיֹּאמֶר הָאִישׁ אֵל עָלַי to וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ, the present MT arose.<sup>21</sup>

From this overview concerning these verses, we see that the majority of authors consider the second LXX translation, in v.15b, to be the original OG, while a good number maintain that the information about Eli's age and blindness in v.15a may have been a later addition, either in MT or already in a text common to MT and LXX's Vorlage. If we compare cod B with Ant, we note that for v.14 וַיֵּשְׁמַע all the way to the end of v.15, B and Ant are in basic agreement. Again, for בָּנָי to אֲנֹכִי, the two texts agree basically. Further, for the Greek plus in v.15b, the two texts differ only at ηχους B = ηχου Ant. For the rest of the Greek plus, however, the two are quite different, as B και ο ανηρ σπευσας προσηλθεν Ηλει και ειπεν αυτω is very close to MT v.14, while Ant και απεκριθη ο ανηρ ο εληλυθως και ειπεν diverges from it quite distinctly. If one presumes that v.15 is original in the text,<sup>22</sup> the following process may account for the present differences in the Greek texts.

First of all, v.15b is LXX's original Greek translation for v.14aβ, later retranslated literally according to

19 Smith, p. 36. Cf. also Schulz and Kittel.

20 Stoebe, p. 134.

21 McCarter, p. 112. This has the merit of being a fairly simple explanation for the present state of the text, but it may be too coincidental that a textual accident had the good fortune to occur precisely around the words which cause difficulty here.

22 The fact in LXX Eli asks the question of those standing around implies knowledge of his blindness, and therefore the explicit mention of it was probably in LXX's Vorlage as well.

MT. Because of the mention of "the men standing around" in LXX's original translation, which differed from the later one, it was preserved, but relocated after the mention of Eli's blindness. At the same time, MT v.16 יָבֹג-לֹא שִׂיחָהּ וְיָאֵי was modified to και ειπεν αυτω since the OG και ο ανηρ σπευσας προσηλθεν Ηλει, in its new surroundings, made MT יָבֹג-לֹא superfluous. Then in Ant, this redundant phrase was modified to και απεκριθη ο ανηρ ο εληλυθως.

This explanation may seem unnecessarily complicated, but the last observation on Ant's text seems to provide the confirmation of its correctness, for it departs so widely from the text that it arouses suspicion and, more importantly, cannot be the response to Eli's question in LXX v.15b, which was addressed, according to LXX, to the "men standing around." It must be the response to the question Eli had asked already in v.14. The use of the perfect participle here is a further indication of this. At v.16, MT יָבֹג-לֹא שִׂיחָהּ וְיָאֵי is simply the continuation of the narrative from v.14 where the man has rushed to Eli's side to give him news of the battle. The form of v.16 in LXX<sup>B</sup>, και ο ανηρ σπευσας προσηλθεν Ηλει και ειπεν, is a repetition of v.14, the sign of the double translation, while the Ant text here, και απεκριθη ο ανηρ ο εληλυθως και ειπεν, witnesses to the later modification of the Greek text as described above. It is only MT's text that makes sense here.

For the rest of the original OG translation for v.14, και ειπεν Ηλει τοις ανδρασιν τοις περιεστηκοσιν αυτω Τις η φωνη του ηχους τουτου;, this may indicate that LXX had a slightly different Hebrew text from MT וְיָאֵי מִהַמָּוֶה. The proper name Eli could, however, have been an addition made by the Greek translator himself in order to clarify the subject. Further, ηχος for וְיָאֵי is found at 1 Sam 14:19 as well so no difference in the Hebrew need be presumed here. The only major difference between LXX and MT, therefore, is LXX's τοις ανδρασιν τοις περιεστηκοσιν, the men to whom Eli addressed his question. Even here we need not necessarily see a different Vorlage, as LXX, unsatisfied with the fact that in the Hebrew text Eli's

question was addressed to no one in particular, could have added the words on its own initiative.

Thus, for the Greek plus here, we find the original OG relocated after another translation closer to MT had been added to the text. The OG has been modified somewhat to fit its new surroundings, and has undergone even more modifications in the text of Ant. The OG here, however, does not necessarily indicate that its Vorlage was different from the text of MT.

### 1 Sam 15:3

MT: ענה לך והכיתה את-עמלק והחרמתם את-כל-אשר-לו ולא תחמל  
עליו והמתה...

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και νυν πορευου και παταξεις τον Αμαληκ και Ιερειμ  
και παντα τα αυτου, και ου περιποιηση εξ αυτου και  
εξολεθρευσεις αυτον και αναθεματιεις αυτον και παντα  
τα αυτου, και ου φειση απ'αυτου και αποκτενεις...

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και νυν πορευου, και παταξεις τον Αμεληκ και παντα  
τα αυτου, και ου περιποιηση εξ αυτου ουθεν, και  
εξολεθρευσεις αυτον και παντα τα αυτου, και ανα-  
θεματιεις αυτον και παντα τα αυτου, και ου μη φεισει  
αυτου, και αποκτενεις...

In Samuel's instruction to Saul to destroy the Amalekites, we find a plus in Greek which represents a double, and partially a triple, translation. Καὶ Ἱερειμ, absent only from mss b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>, appears to have been a misreading of וחרמתם in the original OG.<sup>23</sup> Since LXX continues και παντα του αυτου, virtually all commentators have corrected to ...ו אתו וחרמתם or וחרמתו. <sup>24</sup> LXX<sup>25</sup>

23 Thus, explicitly, Houbigant, Wellhausen, Peters, Nowack, Dhorme, Schulz, McCarter. All the other authors seem to have tacitly admitted a double translation here.

24 Stoebe, p. 283, who notes, in defense of MT here, "everywhere where it is a question of booty, the people as a whole appear," but the overwhelming evidence for a singular here seems to speak against MT. Cf. Vg, Tg, Syr, all of which read the singular.

25 Except for mss d l p y, which omit και ου περιποιηση -- και παντα τα αυτου.



then goes on to translate יָלַי לִמְנָח וְכִי as και ου περιποιηση εξ αυτου, after which it returns to οπηρηθη with και εξολεθρευσεις αυτον. Then, και αναθεματιεις αυτον και παντα τα αυτου και ου φειση απ' αυτου represents a return to οπηρηθη, but this time it is uninterrupted all the way to יָלַי.

All commentators have correctly discerned a double translation here, although they leave unanswered the question of which might have been the original OG.<sup>26</sup>

The verb ορη, after apparently being misread as a proper name, Ιερειμ, is translated as εξολεθρευσεις and then as αναθεματιεις. The first of these verbs is the translation of ορη in Deut, Josh, Judg, 1 Sam, 1 Kgs, 2 Chr, and occurs no less than eight times in 1 Sam 15 for ορη (vv. 3,8[A], 9,9, 15,18,20,21). Αναθεματιζειν, on the other hand, translates ορη in Num, Deut, Josh, Judg, 2 Kgs, 1 Chr, 2 Esd, but in 1 Sam occurs only here at 15:3. Further, αναθεματιζειν is found for εξολεθρουν in the margin of mss j z at 15:9, and of j m (under λ) at 15:21. At 15:21 b o z (mg) c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> contain the same variant.

For the verb ληη, φειδεσθαι is used 22 times (in Ex, 1 Sam [at 15:3 only], 2 Sam, 2 Chr, Job, Prv, Joel, Jer, Lam, Ez), whereas περιποιειν is used only at 1 Sam 15:3.9.15. In marginal notations at 15:15 we find, for περιποιησατο: θ' εφισατο in ms b; A' εφεισατο in mss j z; λ' εφισατω in ms m. At 2 Sam 21:7 mss b o z (mg) c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> (probably OG here) have περιποιησατο where all others read εφεισατο.

All of this evidence taken together indicates that, as far as 1 Sam 15:3 is concerned, εξολεθρευσεις<sup>27</sup> and περιποιηση were the original verbs, whereas αναθεματιεις and φειση seem to bear the mark of a later addition. Thus, it

26 Cf. Wellhausen, "Welche die ursprüngliche sei, ist für unsere Zweck gleichgiltig", p. 96.

27 At Josh 11:14 and 2 Kgs 9:7 we find εξολεθρουν for הכי hiphil. That it may have been the secondary translation for הכיחיל in 15:3 is possible, but its object αυτον presupposes that Αμαληκ was already in the text.

would seem that και Ιερειμ και παντα τα αυτου και ου περιποίηση εξ αυτου was the original OG here. The correction of Ιερειμ to και εξολεθρευσεις αυτον was then made (perhaps originally as a marginal correction which then found its way into the text), after which the entire half-verse was later re-translated as και αναθεματιεις κτλ.<sup>28</sup> Even though present in cod B which give the OG text here, it is probable that this second translation represents later editorial activity.

## 2 Sam 2:22b

MT: וַיִּרְאֵהוּ אֲשָׁחַל בְּנֵי אֲבִינֵר וְאֶבְנֵר

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και πως αρω το προσωπον μου προς Ιωαβ; και που εστιν ταυτα; επιστρεφε προς Ιωαβ τον αδελφον σου.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και πως αρω το προσωπον μου προς Ιωαβ τον αδελφον σου.

In 2 Sam 2:22, where Asahel is pursuing Abner and the latter implores Asahel to turn away, LXX<sup>B</sup>, along with the majority of Greek mss, contains a plus which reads και που εστιν ταυτα; επιστρεφε προς Ιωαβ. Although Thenius and Peters accept this plus as original, blaming its omission from MT on an accident due to homeoteleuton, all others follow Wellhausen in seeing in the plus of B the original OG translation here which had been made from a corrupt Hebrew text.<sup>29</sup> Thus OG appears to have read וַיִּרְאֵהוּ for וַיִּרְאֵהוּ, and נָקַר (Hummelauer) or הָלַךְ (Driver) for אֲשָׁחַל. The mss N b' g i o omit και που ... προς Ιωαβ while c<sub>2</sub> placed the entire second half here, και που ... τον αδελφον σου, under ÷.<sup>30</sup> Because of the position of τον αδελφον σου in the majority of the mss, it appears that the Greek was corrected according to MT only as far as אֲבִינֵר-בְּנֵי and then inserted before the faulty Greek translation.

28 The entire section from και εξολεθρευσεις to και ου φειση απ' αυτου is under ÷ in ms c<sub>2</sub>.

29 Wellhausen, p. 155.

30 Mss b z c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> contain τον αδελφον σου after each of the occurrences of προσ Ιωαβ.

Peters argued, against Wellhausen, that in Sam פנה never corresponds to επιστρέφειν, and that אֵיךְ, neither in Sam nor elsewhere corresponds to ποῦ. His own suggestion is to read (אחִיךְ) וְאָנָה אַעֲלֶה שׁוֹב אֶל-יְיָ, although he is forced to admit himself that "mit ταῦτα an sich ist nichts zu machen", and, since its consonants in Hebrew would have been אלה, he posits a fallen letter to give אַעֲלֶה.<sup>31</sup> There is, however, no way of accounting for the falling out of an 'ayin here, and, while it is true that επιστρέφειν does not occur for פנה in Sam, it does occur eighteen times in Gen - Judg, which could easily have led the LXX translators to use the verb here. Further, his argument against אֵיךְ does not stand if one accepts Wellhausen's hypothesis that the LXX Vorlage was corrupt here.

2 Sam 2:22, therefore, may be understood as containing a double translation in the Greek text, giving first the text corrected according to MT and then the original OG, preserved here perhaps precisely because it diverged from the Hebrew, but not intended to indicate a more original or more correct Hebrew Vorlage.

## 2 Sam 13:15-16a

- MT:           וַיִּשְׁנֶאֱמָנוּ שְׁנָאָה גְדוֹלָה מֵאֵד כִּי גְדוֹלָה הַשְׁנָאָה אֲשֶׁר שְׁנָאָה  
מֵאֵהָבָה אֲשֶׁר אֵהָבָה וַיֹּאמְרוּ-לָהּ אֲמִינוּן קוֹמִי לְכִי<sup>16</sup> וְתֹאמַר לִי  
לֹא-אוֹדֹת הָרָעָה הַגְּדוֹלָה הַזֹּאת מֵאֲחֶרֶת אֲשֶׁר-עָשִׂית עִמִּי לְשַׁלְחֹנִי
- LXX<sup>B</sup>:       <sup>15</sup>καὶ ἐμίσησεν αὐτὴν Ἀμὼν μίσος μέγα σφοδρά, ὅτι  
μέγα τὸ μίσος ὃ ἐμίσησεν αὐτὴν, μείζων ἢ κακία ἡ  
ἐσχάτη ἡ ἡ πρώτη, ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀγαπὴν ἣν ἠγάπησεν αὐτὴν.  
καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Ἀμὼν Ἀναστῆθι καὶ πορεύου. <sup>16</sup>καὶ  
εἶπεν αὐτῷ θάμαρ περὶ τῆς κακίας τῆς μεγάλης ταύτης.  
Ὑπὲρ ἑτέραν ἣν ἐποίησας μετ' ἐμοῦ τοῦ ἐξαποστεῖλαι με·
- LXX<sup>Ant</sup>:   <sup>15</sup>καὶ ἐμίσησεν αὐτὴν Ἀμὼν μίσος μέγα σφοδρά, ὅτι  
μέγα τὸ μίσος ὃ ἐμίσησεν αὐτὴν ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀγαπῆσιν ἣν  
ἠγάπησεν αὐτὴν. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Ἀμὼν Ἀναστῆθι καὶ  
ἀποτρέχε. <sup>16</sup>καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ θάμαρ Μη, ἀδελφε· ὅτι  
μεγάλη ἡ κακία ἡ ἐσχάτη ὑπὲρ τὴν πρώτην ἣν πεποίηκας  
μετ' ἐμοῦ, τοῦ ἐξαποστεῖλαι με.

---

31 Peters, pp. 136 f.

When Thamar answers Amnon's flared-up anger after he has lain with her, the text of cod B contains a plus in v.15, and both MT and cod B agree on an incomprehensible reading, against Ant, in v.16.

The various forms of the apparently repeated sentence are as follows:

MT: מְהִימָה מְאִדָּה הָיָה לְיָגֵן הָעַרְה נְתִיקָא-זָא

LXX<sup>B</sup>(v.15)<sup>32</sup>: μειζων η κακια η εσχατη η η πρωτη

LXX<sup>B</sup>(v.16)<sup>33</sup>: περι της κακιας της μεγαλης ταυτης Υπερ ετερων

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>(16)<sup>34</sup>: μη αδελφε οτι μεγαλη η κακια η εσχατη υπερ την πρωτην

OL<sup>V</sup> (v.16): noli frater expellere me quoniam maior erit haec malitia novissima quam prior

Wellhausen considered the plus at v.15 to be a part of the genuine OG for v.16, although he did not account for the difference between μειζων and μεγαλη as found in v.16.<sup>35</sup> If we consider the text of Ant to provide the genuine OG, its text for v.16 (μεγαλη η κακια η εσχατη υπερ την πρωτην) appears to be closer to the Hebrew than the plus in v.15 (cf. especially μεγαλη against μειζων). The plus in v.15 appears to be a misplaced note in order to explain the text. It is the only formulation of this sentence which, in good Greek, expresses the thought of the confused text with clarity and succinctness. That its form is closer to the text of Ant than that of cod B (for v.16) would seem to be the confirmation that Ant contains the OG and the plus in v.15 is a re-statement in better Greek expressing OG's original thought.

The text of MT appears to be somewhat disturbed for v.16. Cod B provides a literal translation (cf. περι for נְתִיקָא-זָא), although neither in Hebrew nor in Greek does

32 Thus mss B d u a<sub>2</sub>. The same words preceded by οτι, are found in e f j m<sup>p</sup> q s t w y<sup>b</sup> z.

33 Thus mss B A c x a<sub>2</sub>. For ετερων in B, A x a<sub>2</sub> have εταιρων, and c υπερτερα.

34 All mss except B A c x a<sub>2</sub>.

35 Wellhausen, p. 186.



it make much sense.<sup>36</sup> By far the majority of authors has corrected the text, on the basis of Ant's reading, to אל אחי על אורח.<sup>37</sup> Houbigant suggested an original אל אחי על, blaming the loss of על אחי on a scribal error,<sup>38</sup> although such a form is not attested in any of the Greek texts. If אחי is original, however, the text of Ant, μη αδελφε, did not include the possessive in its translation.<sup>39</sup> That this may be another sign of the original OG text is suggested by אל אחי in 13:12 where mss b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> stand alone in translating μη αδελφε against the majority μη αδελφε μου. Some sort of introduction to Thamar's speech is required here and neither MT אל-אורח nor cod B περι satisfies this requirement, so we may accept OG's form as the more original here, of which MT is a corruption.

As far as the end of this phrase is concerned, Wellhausen suggested that מאחרת indirectly attests to an original האחרת and that the OG requires that the original text read האחרת מהראשנה...(for η εσχάτη [υπερ] την πρώτην). If this is so, then MT הזאת מאחרת could be a corruption of this, but such a correction might not be necessary if OG simply translated according to the sense here, rightly taking מאחרת to refer to the "other" wickedness, i.e., the first. Instead of translating it by ετερος, as we find in the more literal (B) A x a<sub>2</sub>, it took the liberty of rendering it as περὶ, which was the evident sense.

For הרעה הגדולה הזאת, however, it is hard to see how MT can be in order. The text of Ant reflects an original הרעה הגדולה הזאת,<sup>40</sup> which indeed seems necessary

36 Cod B, in translating אל-אורח as περι, understood על-אורח here, as confirmed by περι (for על-אורח) at Gen 21:11.25; 26:32; Josh 14:6.

37 Thenius, Wellhausen, Löhr, Driver, Smith, Budde, Nowack, Graetz, Dhorme, Kittel, RSV, Osty.

38 Houbigant, p. 340, followed by Peters.

39 NAB and Eü alone respect Ant's lack of possessive.

40 Which is accepted by Thenius, Wellhausen, Löhr, Nowack, Budde, Driver, Dhorme, Kittel. Graetz proposed הרעה הזאת הגדולה, followed by Peters and Schulz.

και παντες οι παιδες ... και πας ο Φελεθθαι; και πας ο λαος... μαχηται; and και παρησαν ... οι Γεθθθαιοι all translate the same Hebrew text: יוני-לכ to יתנה-לכ. The text of Ant contains the first two of these translations, although in a slightly different form. Wellhausen has shown how the original OG, και πας ο λαος ... οι μαχηται, was surrounded by two more literal translations of the same clause,<sup>41</sup> and Barthélemy has described a process of "mutual contamination" of the Palestinian (here cod B) and Antiochian traditions which led to the present form of the Greek text in cod B.<sup>42</sup> A considerable number of mss have expunged the repeated phrases, although in doing so have eliminated the text of OG as well.<sup>43</sup> Virtually all commentators have recognized the repetitiousness of LXX and read with MT, at least as far as v.18 is concerned.

In v.17b, in the text of the original OG isolated by Wellhausen, for MT בנית המדבר ויעמוד, we read και εστησαν επι της ελαιας εν τη ερημω, now situated after one of the secondary translations of v.18a, in place of και εστησαν εν οικω τω μακρυν. The mss B A b c h o x c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub><sup>44</sup> read with MT here and all of these except for the hexaplaric A c x also contain the OG later on in v.18. Thus we have an instance here as well (i.e., in B b h o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>) of the same contamination described by Barthélemy,<sup>45</sup> with the exception that, for v.18a, the two (or three) translations reflect the same Hebrew base while here in v.17b OG seems to presume an original בניית המדבר.<sup>46</sup> Böttcher stands alone among the commentators in proposing this reading here as original,<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Wellhausen, p. 195.

<sup>42</sup> Barthélemy, Les Devanciers, pp. 124 f.

<sup>43</sup> A M N a c d e f i j m n p q s t u v w x y z(txt) b<sub>2</sub> omit from και<sup>2</sup> to αυτου<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>44</sup> Thus, the mss which for this section ordinarily contain the kaigé recension (B), the OG (b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>), and the hexaplaric recension (A c x).

<sup>45</sup> Barthélemy, Les Devanciers, pp. 124 f.

<sup>46</sup> Followed by OL<sup>V</sup> as well: steterunt ad olivam in deserto.

<sup>47</sup> Böttcher, p. 185. Ewald and Thenius would insert it into v.18 following LXX B and Ant.

and NAB is alone among the modern translations in proposing "... they halted opposite the ascent of the Mount of Olives, at a distance."

In order to explain the mention of the "olive tree in the desert" in Greek, we must turn to v.23b, where for MT על-פני-דרך את-המדבר, the mss b o z(mg) c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> OL<sup>V</sup> read προ προσώπου αυτού (>z[mg]) κατά (και β') την οδόν της ελαιας της εν ερημω. The difficulty of the Hebrew expression here plus the variant in Greek have suggested an original reading of הִזִּית אֶשֶׁר בַּמְדָּבָר<sup>48</sup> or זִית הַמְדָּבָר<sup>49</sup> blaming the MT form on a corruption of זִית into אֶשֶׁר. Wellhausen, while accepting על-פני, reads המדבר דרך, but notes that the אֶשֶׁר might be a residue of something which originally intervened here.<sup>50</sup> König, on the other hand, suggested that the זִית could be a corruption of אֶשֶׁר which, having transformed the text of v.23b was then inserted into v.18.<sup>51</sup> Note that in either case, the corruption could only have taken place in Hebrew, and therefore, LXX's Vorlage must already have read זִית here in v.23.

In 2 Sam 15:28, the olive tree again appears in OG. For MT בַּעֲבוּרֵי הַמְדָּבָר,<sup>52</sup> mss b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub><sup>53</sup> contain επι της ελαιας εν τη ερημω. Here, however, no one suggests accepting the Greek variant, and Klostermann maintained that it is a correction in Greek according to v.23.<sup>54</sup>

The final mention of olives in this chapter (and the only one in MT) is in v.30, where David, after all the troops have passed and Zadok and Abiathar have taken the ark back into Jerusalem, goes up the Ascent of Olives (עֹלָה בַּמַּעֲלָה). Here the mss B A b c o x a<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> follow MT while

48 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, Driver, Budde (SBOT), Nowack, Dhorme (1910).

49 Ewald, Thenius<sup>2</sup>, Böttcher, Klostermann, Budde (KHAT), Smith.

50 Wellhausen, p. 197.

51 König, Lehrgebäude, Syntax, 288m.

52 Qere בַּעֲבוּרֵי and ἀπαβωθ in cod B.

53 As well as an anonymous marginal reading in cod M.

54 Klostermann, p. 202.



the rest insert του οπους after αναβασις.<sup>55</sup>

Thus, while it is possible that a textual accident could have produced זית from an original זית in v.17b, and אא from an original זית in v.23, it would seem too coincidental and it is highly unlikely that both occurrences of זית would have disappeared in that way. Further, no similar textual accident would explain how an original זית could have resulted in נעבירות in v.28. An additional difficulty in v.17 is the explanation of how המרחק could be a textual corruption of המדבר. In v.23, however, the material difference between זית המדבר and אא המדבר is so slight as to suggest that it was here that the original variant or corruption was introduced into the text. The expression על-פני-דרך אא-המדבר is somewhat difficult, but the preposition אא, used after a verb of motion to indicate direction, while rare, does occur (cf. Num 13:17 וועליתם אא-ההר; Deut 1:19 ונלך אא (ידע לכתך אא-המדבר. Deut 2:7 כל-המדבר). The fact that eleven mss in Kennicott and seven in De Rossi omit אא reveals אא המדבר as the lectio difficilior which nevertheless yields good sense.

It must be admitted that the LXX olive tree has originality of thought in its favor, but the nearness of the mention of the Ascent of Olives, in v.30, makes it plausible that LXX's Vorlage, faced with אא המדבר, in perhaps an illegible form, chose to read זית. Most eloquent against an original location designated by "the olive tree in the desert" in v.23, however, and decisive for accepting the MT reading as original here, is the fact that, in v.23, King David and the people have just crossed the brook Kidron and, therefore, have not yet arrived at the desert, but are simply on the road toward the desert.

Thus, LXX must have found its Vorlage with זית המדבר already in the text here. Whether the other instances of "the olive tree in the desert", in vv.17 and 28 OG, were

<sup>55</sup> Aside from this reference, partially represented in the Greek tradition, the only other mention of the Mount of Olives in OT is found at Zech 14:4 (הר הזיתים).

also in the Vorlage or not is more difficult to decide, and they may witness to LXX's own desire for uniformity and consistency.

Returning to vv. 17b-18, the original OG, which should be found in Ant here, minus the contamination from cod B, would be as follows:

17<sup>b</sup> και εστησαν επι της ελαιας εν τη ερημω. 18 και πας ο λαος παρεπορευετο εχομενος αυτου. και παντες οι αδροι και παντες οι περι αυτον και παντες οι μαχηται του βασιλεως και εξακοσιοι ανδρες οι ηγοντες εκ Γεθ πεζοι παρεπορευοντο κατα προσωπον του βασιλεως.

This text, even with the secondary translations removed, still appears to show some slight editorial activity, as a comparison with cod B shows (reversal of οι αδροι and οι περι αυτον; addition in Ant of του βασιλεως with οι μαχηται; και before εξακοσιοι; εκ Γεθ in Ant for εις Γεθ in B). While the last of these occurs in a number of mss,<sup>56</sup> the other variations occur only in b g o z(mg) c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>, which may indicate that they did not belong to the original OG text but are later modifications.<sup>57</sup> An obvious characteristic of OG here is that it has replaced the proper names for the Cherethites, Pelethites and Gittites with common substantives. Most commentators have suggested that יחנני be replaced by הגררים because of OG οι μαχηται,<sup>58</sup> or that the text read יחנני אחי אנשי,<sup>59</sup> or that Ittai's name be inserted.<sup>60</sup> No such change in the Hebrew text seems necessary though, for if μαχηται is original OG, a proper name could easily have stood in the text just as with the Cherethites and Pelethites. The fact that OG has nothing

56 In addition to b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>: M d e f j m n p q s t u w y z b<sub>2</sub> and εν Γεθ in N<sup>2</sup>i a<sub>2</sub>.

57 If this is so, then cod B here preserved OG in a more primitive form than Ant.

58 Thenius, Wellhausen.

59 Klostermann, Budde, Dhorme, Ehrlich.

60 Schulz, Hertzberg.

more than μαχηται here is, in addition, an indication that nothing more than מִלְחָמָה stood in its Vorlage, which does not appear to have differed from MT here.<sup>61</sup>

The result of this investigation is that both cod B and Ant have preserved OG here, but each has also been contaminated by secondary translations which follow MT more literally. The original OG appears to have followed a Vorlage which differed from MT at v.17b (although the "olive tree" may be due to LXX harmonization), but which appears to have been the same as MT for v.18.

## 2 Sam 15:19b-20a

MT: וְגַם-גִּלְיָה אָתָּה לְמִקְוֶה חֲמוּל כּוֹאֵךְ וְהַיּוֹם אֲנוּעַךְ עִמּוֹ לָלֶכֶת  
וְאֲנִי הוֹלֵךְ עַל אֲשֶׁר-אֲנִי הוֹלֵךְ

LXX<sup>B</sup>: 19b και οτι μετωκηκας συ εκ του τοπου σου. 20 ει εχθες  
παραγεγονας, και σημερον κινησω σε μεθ'ημων; και  
γε μετανασθηςεις τον τοπον σου· εχθες η εξελευσις  
σου, και σημερον μετακινησω σε μεθ'ημων του πορευ-  
θηναι; και εγω προευσσομαι εφ ου αν εγω πορευθω.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: 19b και οτι μετωκησας εκ του τοπου σου. 20 ει  
εχθες παραγεγονας συ, και σημερον κινησω σε του  
πορευεσθαι μεθ'ημων; εγω δε πορευσομαι ου εαν πορευομαι.

Once again we find a double translation, where David exhorts Ittai the Gittite to return to his home. The plus is present, however, only in mss B h a<sub>2</sub> which, after giving the original OG for vv.19b-20, insert another translation, και γε μετανασθηςεις τον τοπον σου· εχθες η εξελευσις σου, και σημερον μετακινησω σε μεθ'ημων (του πορευθηναι). As Barthélemy has pointed out, και γε here in B is the sign of the later recension.<sup>62</sup> Apart from Thenius who, basing his judgment on a Vulgate text into which OL had been inserted, maintains the longer, duplicated text as original,<sup>63</sup> all others have

61 That μαχηται is typical of OG is confirmed by the fact that for Sam-Kgs it occurs only twice in cod B (2 Sam 15:18 and 24:9). In both of these cases there is no Hebrew equivalent in the text. Further, μαχηται replaces δυνατος or δυναμως in b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> at 2 Sam 16:6; 17:10 (bis); 23:17.

62 Barthélemy, Les Devanciers, p. 114.

63 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 199.

discerned the double translation here.

The plus in the kaigé recension found in cod B has been re-translated in order to bring it closer to MT, as η εξελευσις σου for παραγεγονας in OG indicates. That a certain amount of contamination has taken place in the mss is shown by μετωκηκας ου in B A a h a<sub>2</sub> c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>, whereas the other Ant mss (b and b') read μετωκησας. The double translation in kaigé runs only from ουι to ουνι, as ככל is translated only once in B, although it has modified OG's πορευεσθαι to πορευθηναι. The OG text, transmitted by Ant and preserved in B alongside that of kaigé, does not appear to presume a Hebrew Vorlage which differed from MT.

## 2 Sam 15:34a

MT: ואם-העור תשוב ואמר לאבשלום עבדך אני המלך אהיה עבד אבני  
ואני מאז ועתה ואני עבדך

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και αν εις την πολιν επιστρεψης, και ερεις τω  
Αβεσσαλωμ Διεληλυθασιν οι αδελφοι σου, και ο βασιλευς  
κατοπισθεν μου διεληλυθεν ο πατηρ σου· και νυν παις  
σου ειμι, βασιλευ, εασον με ζησαι· παις του πατρος  
σου ημην tote και αρτιως, και νυν εγω δουλος σος·

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: εαν δε εις την πολιν αναστρεψης, και επεις τω  
Αβεσσαλωμ Διεληλυθασιν οι αδελφοι σου, και ο βασιλευς  
ο πατηρ σου κατ'οπισθεν μου διεληλυθεν· και νυν  
παις σου ειμι, βασιλευ· εασον με ζησαι· παις του  
πατρος σου ημην tote και αρτιως, και νυν εγω δουλος  
σος.

The Greek text here contains a double translation for this verse which, at first sight, seems to presume an entirely different Hebrew text. According to MT, David, atop the Ascent of Olives after fleeing from Absalom, gives instructions to Hushai to return to Jerusalem and infiltrate into Absalom's household on the strength of the fact that he had been David's servant and now wants to serve Absalom. This is reproduced in Greek as well, but first another text intervenes in which Hushai is instructed to say to Absalom that "your brothers have gone away and the king, your father, has gone after me." The textual situation is complicated by the fact that Ant reproduces this sentence at the end of v.36:

και ερεις τω Αβεσσαλωμ Διεληλυθασιν οι αδελφοι σου, και ο βασιλευς κατ'οπισθεν μου διεληλυθεν ο πατηρ σου, και εγω αρτιως αφιγμαι, και εγω δουλος σος.

This plus in Ant, however, mirrors the text of cod B for v.34, not that of Ant, in addition to containing a reading of its own, και εγω αφιγμαι, και εγω δουλος σος.

Thenius and the majority of others after him read with MT here,<sup>64</sup> with the observation that LXX represents a corruption of MT into יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה. Klostermann, followed by Smith, Budde and Nowack, proposed reading with LXX on the grounds that MT is "meaningless".<sup>65</sup>

Barthélemy maintains that the OG reading for v.34 was και ερεις τω Αβεσσαλωμ και νυν παις σου ειμι βασιλευ εασον με ζησαι. παις του πατρος σου ημην τοτε και νυν εγω δουλος σος, i.e., almost exactly as found in MT except for the addition of και νυν, and η'ηκ (εασον με ζησαι) in place of MT η'ηκ. The LXX translator then found another passage in his Vorlage, at the end of v.36 ("issu sans doute d'une répétition erronée"), which, when translated, produced what is now found in Ant v.36b, και ερεις Αβεσσαλωμ διεληλυθασιν κτλ. The Palestinian recension then extracted the plus from the end of v.36 which was then, or later, inserted into v.34 in the form of a marginal notation at first, but then incorporated into the text to result in the doublet. Then the Antiochian recension borrowed the overloaded text form of Pal., but also kept the longer OG form of v.36, which resulted in a triplet.<sup>66</sup>

Thus, Barthélemy places the origin of the erroneous double reading on the level of a Hebrew text, with regard both to its form and its position, although it was a later contamination on the level of the Greek recensions which produced the double reading.

<sup>64</sup> Thenius, Keil, Erdmann, Wellhausen, Driver, Dhorme, Kittel, Schulz, Hertzberg, RSV, NEB, NAB, BJ, Osty, TOB, Eü.

<sup>65</sup> Klostermann, p. 203.

<sup>66</sup> Barthélemy, Les Devanciers, p. 124.

In the most recent study of 15:34, J. Treballe concludes that LXX's reading is to be preferred and that its original place was at v.36b.<sup>67</sup> In his article he submits vv.34 and 36 to a close analysis as a result of which he maintains that the Hebrew form suggested by the plus of v.36 Ant was the following: ואמר לאבשלום עברו אחיך והמלך אחרו ואני עברך ואמר לאבשלום עברו אחיך והמלך אחרו ואני עברך<sup>68</sup> which represents the original Hebrew for this text, and which is confirmed by the presence of the otherwise difficult ואני...ואני, which has survived in MT.<sup>69</sup> As far as its position in v.36 is concerned, Treballe suggests that, on the one hand, with this sentence absent from v.34, that verse becomes more closely tied to David's invocation in v.31a ("Turn the counsel of Ahitophel into foolishness, O Lord."), and, on the other, with David's instructions to Hushai appearing in v.36b, it fits better with the overall plan for Hushai to organize a secret information service with Zadok and Abiathar as his agents.<sup>70</sup>

As inviting as this solution may appear to be, especially since it reinforces Treballe's general theory of the utility of the Greek recensions for discerning the Hebrew "Ur-Text" when it differs from MT,<sup>71</sup> his preference for the Ant form here poses several problems.

First, if the Hebrew "Ur-Text" read as he would have it, the phrase עבר אחיך והמלך אחרו seems to be rather a strain on Hebrew grammar, and yet, if the text is to correspond to its counterpart in v.34, it must follow this word order.

Second, in his justification of the Ant form, Treballe mentions nowhere in his article exactly what

67 J. Treballe, "Espías contra consejeros en la revuelta de Absalón (II Sam XV, 34-36). Historia de la recensión como método," RB 86 (1979) 524-543.

68 On נגעתו for ἀφίγμαι, cf. Barthélemy, Les Devanciers, p. 124.

69 Treballe, "Espías...", p. 533.

70 Treballe, "Espías...", p. 536.

71 Treballe, "Espías...", pp. 541 ff.

Διεληλυθασιν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σου καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς κατ' ὀπισθεν μου διεληλυθεν ὁ πατήρ σου might mean, nor precisely why it is to be preferred to the MT form.

Third, aside from a passing reference in a footnote,<sup>72</sup> he does not mention 2 Sam 16:19, where, when Hushai is actually speaking with Absalom, he says, "And again, whom shall I serve? Should it not be his son? As I have served your father, thus I will be before you," which reproduces the thought of MT 15:34 accurately enough without being so close grammatically as to raise the suspicion of any reciprocal influence.<sup>73</sup>

Finally, Trebolle's difficulty with a long interval between protasis and apodosis<sup>74</sup> does not necessarily speak against the originality of the text. If the apodosis is to make sense, David must tell Hushai in the protasis why Ahitophel's counsel will be defeated, or at least what Hushai's part in the plan will be.

It seems clear that the alternate reading from Ant v.36b presumes a Hebrew text which differed from MT and which probably read as Trebolle suggests. For the reasons stated above, however, it does not seem possible that this could have been the original text here. As far as MT is concerned, the only difficulty it presents is the explanation of the twice-repeated וְאֲנִי. Tg has maintained them exactly as in MT although LXX omitted them, while Vg modified according to the general sense of the verse (sicut fui servus patris tui sic ero servus tuus). A number of commentators simply omit the waw in each case,<sup>75</sup> without explaining how they might

72 Trebolle, "Espías...", p. 537, note 28.

73 MT for 2 Sam 16:19 reads: וְהִשָּׁנִיָּה לְמִי אֲנִי אֶעֱבֹד הֲלוֹא לְפָנָיו בָּנוּ כֵּן אֲהִיָּה לְפָנָיו כַּאֲשֶׁר עֲבָדְתִּי לְפָנָיו אֲבִיךָ כֵּן אֲהִיָּה לְפָנָיו here (LXX εἰς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ) may be a clue that אֲהִיָּה in 15:34 is original as well, whereas LXX εἰς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς seems to indicate that it read אֲהִיָּה.

74 Trebolle, "Espías...", p. 535.

75 Hummelauer, Driver, Dhorme, Kittel, Schulz, Hertzberg, RSV, NEB, NAB, BJ, Osty.

have arisen. The fact, however, that they occur as apparent correlatives may be an indication that, if they are original, they are intended to provide some kind of emphasis to Hushai's plea to be accepted as Absalom's servant ("Even I who was once your father's servant, so now I myself will be your servant.").<sup>76</sup>

Whether LXX reproduces its Vorlage faithfully here, or whether the divergent text is due to an additional reading as Barthélemy suggested, it seems clear that LXX here reflects a corruption of a text which was at one time similar to that of MT. The MT presents David's plan for Hushai to infiltrate into Absalom's household by becoming his servant, and Hushai's actual proposal of the plan to Absalom, in 2 Sam 16:19, shows that the MT of 15:34 is in keeping with the flow of the narrative. LXX's form, on the other hand, with its wordy repetition of the news of the departure of Absalom's brothers and father, seems meaningless in the context here. If it was the original OG, it attests to a corruption which already took place in the Vorlage.

## 2 Sam 18:18

MT: ואבשלום קהל ויצב-לו בחיו תא-מחבא אשר בעב-המלה כי אמר אין-  
 לי בן בעבור הוציאו שמי ויקרא למצבת-לשמו ויקרא לה יד  
 אבשלום עד היום הזה

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και Αβεσσαλωμ επι ζων και εστησεν εαυτω την στηλην  
 εν η ελημφθη και εστηλωσεν αυτην λαβειν, την στηλην  
 την εν τη κοιλαδι του βασιλεως, οτι ειπεν ουκ εστιν  
 αυτω υιος ενεκεν του αναμνησαι το ονομα αυτου· και  
 εκαλεσεν την στηλην χειρ Αβεσσαλωμ εως της ημερας  
 ταυτης.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και Αβεσσαλωμ επι ζων ελαβεν και εστησεν εαυτω στηλην  
 εν τη κοιλαδι του βασιλεως, οτι ελεγεν Ουκ εστι μοι  
 υιος, ινα αναμιμνησκηται το ονομα μου. και εκαλεσεν  
 την στηλην επι τω ονοματι αυτου, και επεκαλεσεν αυτην  
 χειρ Αβεσσαλωμ εως της ημερας ταυτης.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Joüon, 177m: "Assez souvent le waw, comme et dans nos langues exprime plutôt une nuance de sentiment que le lien logique."



In this text which tells of Absalom's setting up a memorial pillar in his honor, the large number of variants in different Greek mss indicates a general dissatisfaction or perplexity concerning this verse. Mss B c e h\* w x y<sup>b</sup> a<sub>2</sub> appear to contain a double reading here, various parts of which are found in other mss as well. The principal forms of the Greek text for the duplicated section (הָרָבֶּל הַבָּנָה לְאַבְסָלוֹם הַבֶּן־דָּוִד הַבֶּן־נִינְוָה) are as follows:

<u>Bceh*wx y<sup>b</sup> a<sub>2</sub></u>	<u>A</u>	<u>boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub><sup>77</sup></u>
και Αβεσσαλωμ ετι ζων [+και ελαβεν cx] και εστησεν εαυτω την στηλην εν η ελημφθη και εστηλωσεν αυτην λαβειν την στηλην την εν τη κοιλαδι του βασιλεως	και Αβεσσαλωμ      ελημφθη και εστηλωσεν αυτην λαβειν την στηλωσιν την εν τη κοιλαδι του βασιλεως	και Αβεσσαλωμ ετι ζων ελαβεν και εστησεν εαυτω στηλην      εν τη κοιλαδι του βασιλεως

Cod A has preserved one short reading and b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> another, while cod B et al. contains a third form which combines the other two. Barthélemy has shown that εστηλωσεν for the forms of נָנִי is a characteristic of the kaigé recension,<sup>78</sup> which would indicate that the second half of cod B and all of cod A (cf. στηλωσιν for στηλην) contain the kaigé text here. It is most probable, therefore, that the text of Ant preserves the OG. Cod B seems to have taken this text over and then, beginning again at הָרָבֶּל, given its own translation. Cod A is most likely the result of a text which read as B but which simply eliminated the OG part in a rather perfunctory way, as the absence of an antecedent for αυτην indicates. It is important to note here that it is OG and

77 Along with mss M N a g i m u r y\*, with only minor variations from Ant.

78 Barthélemy, Les Devanciers, pp. 59 f.

not kaigé which is the closest to MT, even though OG has changed the word order slightly, placing ετι ζων closer to the beginning of the verse. While Tg follows MT literally here, Syr, either under the influence of OG or through the desire for a more logical flow of thought, reads, "Then Absalom, while he was still alive, took and set up a statue for himself..." Vg, on the other hand, maintained the MT order but dropped נָבַל: "Forro Absalom erexerat sibi cum adhuc viveret titulum..."

Wellhausen maintained that the LXX text here was radically damaged,<sup>79</sup> but if the true Greek text is represented by  $b o c_2 e_2$ , it follows MT closely enough after the doublet has been removed. Klostermann corrected και εστηλωσεν αυτην λαβειν to και εστηλωσεν αυτω λαυειδ, based on an inner-Greek corruption ΛΑΒΕΙΝ - ΔΑΒΕΙΔ, and subsequently relocated v.18a before v.17b on the grounds that David would have set up the monument to his dead son Absalom.<sup>80</sup> This suggestion falters materially, however, by the presence of וְנִיחַ in MT, and by the fact that Absalom is clearly the subject of v.18a. Budde suggested that MT is the result of a deliberate change in order to exculpate David from having set the pillar up,<sup>81</sup> but LXX's basic agreement with MT here, on the fact that it was Absalom who erected the pillar, makes it hard to accept this theory. If such a change had taken place, it must have been before both proto-MT and LXX's Vorlage.

At first glance, the absence of cod B's plus from Ant looks as if it might be attributable to an accident through homeoteleuton at στηλην, but closer inspection reveals that an editor has used this word as the occasion for introducing the second translation here, which ends with στηλην as well.

Further on in v.18, cod B seems to have shortened what may have appeared to be a redundant text. For MT (and

<sup>79</sup> Wellhausen, p. 203.

<sup>80</sup> Klostermann, pp. 215f., followed by Budde and Peters.

<sup>81</sup> Budde (KHAT), p. 285.

Ant) ויקרא למצבת על-שמו ויקרא לה יר אנשלים, B and its congeners have simply και εκαλεσεν την στηλην χειρ Αβεσσαλωμ. That this was a conscious shortening and not an accidental loss is suggested by the presence of την στηλην, which would ordinarily have disappeared through a purely mechanical textual accident.

For this double translation, therefore, it is the text of Ant (here probably OG) which is both the most intelligible and the closest to MT. Cod B has inserted its own translation after that of OG while cod A eliminated the former translation and replaced it with that of cod B's kaigé.

## 2 Sam 19:19a

MT: ועברה העברה לעביר אח-בית המלך ולעשות הטוב בעיניו

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ελειτουρησαν την λειτουργιαν του διαβιβασαι τον βασιλεα· και διεβη η διαβασις εξεγειραι τον οικον του βασιλεως και του ποιησαι το ευθες εν οφθαλμοις αυτου.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ελειτουρησαν την λειτουργιαν αυτων του διαβιβασαι τον βασιλεα και του ποιησαι το αρεστον εν οφθαλμοις αυτου.

LXX, apparently having read ועברו העברה לעביר אח-בית המלך for the opening words of v.19, contains a double translation consisting of this in addition to the MT. The form corresponding to MT is absent only from mss o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>, while the mss b and b' here contain the doublet as well. Opinion is divided on the authentic reading here, as Houbigant, Klostermann, Budde, Peters, Dhorme, Schulz, BJ and Osty read with LXX while the rest, from Thenius through HOTTP basically follow MT. Barthélemy maintains a contamination in the text of the majority of LXX mss such that the original OG, preserved in o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>, was introduced into kaigé to produce a double reading, whereas the αυτων (found only in b' o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>) may attest either to the original OG, later suppressed by kaigé, or to an addition in Ant. An additional double

reading, και του ποιησαι ευθεες ενωπιον αυτου και του ποιησαι (+το b) αρεστον εν οφθαλμοις αυτου, in b and b' only, shows a contamination in the other direction, where the kaigé reading appears after that of Ant.<sup>82</sup> As far as this second doublet is concerned, the situation seems, in fact, slightly more complicated, as b b' have preserved the ευθεες of kaigé, and then introduced ενωπιον αυτου, followed by the reading common to b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>, το αρεστον. This may indicate that OG here was το αρεστον ενωπιον αυτου, while the mss o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> were partially modified according to kaigé.

LXX here seems to have facilitated its reading, although a textual accident already in its Vorlage or a misreading on LXX's part is not to be excluded. Evidence of the former, however, seems to be found in LXX's omission of אא-בית, which may have been considered to be in contradiction to בעינו in the same verse.

As MT stands, ועברה העברה is somewhat problematic, as העברה, "ford", or "ferry",<sup>83</sup> appears to be the subject of ועברה. Within the context of the narrative, a plural verb seems required, as vv. 17 and 18 tell us that Shimei and Ziba, with their men, have come down to the Jordan to accompany the king across. MT, therefore, may be a corruption of ועברו,<sup>84</sup> and LXX μεταβησαντες (ועברו) presumes a plural as well. Vg (transierunt vada) and Tg (ועברו מגוזא) read a plural here, while Syr (w<sup>c</sup>bdw m<sup>c</sup>bry') seems to have combined LXX's ועברו with MT העברה.<sup>85</sup> The singular ועברה can only be read if העברה means "ferry" here, which seems unlikely as there is no other indication elsewhere that a ferry was used to cross the Jordan. LXX's plural assures us that, even if it interchanged daleth for resh, the plural was an old reading here. In addition, the point of the

82 Barthélemy, Les Devanciers, p. 117.

83 BDB and KB give "ford" as the meaning here (cf. 2 Sam 19:19 and perhaps 17:16). Zorell and König give "ferry".

84 Thus Driver, Smith, Hertzberg, RSV, NEB, NAB, Eü. Wellhausen suggested ויעברו, followed by Nowack, Ehrlich, Kittel (who also maintain ועברו as a possibility).

85 Cf. also Josephus "τον ποταμον εγεθρωσεν", Ant. VII, 264.

narrative is that Shimei and Ziba have come personally to bring David across the Jordan (לעניר), and the mention of "service" as in LXX seems strangely out of place in this text where all the emphasis is on the crossing of the river (cf. vv. 32,34,37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42).

For this verse, mss o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> contain only the OG translation, based on an interchange of daleth and resh, while all other mss have added a translation based on MT. The MT here, while probably containing a slight corruption of one letter, gives the more original of the two texts.

## 2 Sam 20:18-19a

- MT: ותאמר לאמר דבר ידברו בראשנה לאמר שא יסאלו באבל וכן  
התמו 18  
...אנכי שלמי אמוני ישראל 19
- LXX<sup>B</sup>: 18 και ειπεν λεγουσα Λογον ελαλησαν εν πρωτοις λεγοντες  
Ηρωτημενος ηρωτηθη εν τη Αβελ και εν Δαν ει εξελιπον  
α εθεντο οι πιστοι του Ισραηλ· ερωντες επερωτησουσιν  
ενα εν Αβελ και ουτως, ει εξελιπον. 19 εγω ειμι ειρηνικα  
των στηριγματων Ισραηλ...
- LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: 18 και ειπεν Λογος ελαληθη εν πρωτοις λεγοντων  
Ηρωτημενος ηρωτηθη εν τη Αβελ και εν Δαν ει εξ-  
ελιπεν α εθεντο οι πιστοι του Ισραηλ. ερωτωντες  
ερωτησουσιν εν Αβελ, και ουτως ει εξελιπον. 19 εγω  
ειμι ειρηνικα των στηριγματων Ισραηλ...

In the plea which the wise woman of Abel Beth-Maacah made to Joab not to destroy the town, the LXX contains a plus which is manifestly a double translation, one text being closer to the MT. The majority of critics has suggested that MT is corrupt here and is to be emended according to the OG ηρωτημενος ηρωτηθη εν τη Αβελ και εν Δαν ει εξελιπεν α εθεντο οι πιστοι του Ισραηλ, which yields, according to Wellhausen's retroversion. שא יסאלו באבל ודן התמו אשר 86 Thus MT וכן is to be considered a corruption in the text, which a later Greek recension would have copied and introduced alongside the original OG. 87 Only the mss M N a g i n v y\* lack the MT correction. OL<sup>V</sup> witnesses to the OG text, although in a slightly different form: Locuti sumus in primis dicentes,

86 Wellhausen, p. 207.

87 Thus Ewald, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Löhr, Nowack, Graetz, Driver, Budde, Smith, Dhorme, BJ, Osty, NAB.

Rogantes rogant qui sunt in Ebel, et in Dan, dicentes, Si defecerunt quae posuerunt fideles Israel.

Both Tg<sup>88</sup> and Syr<sup>89</sup> are widely divergent from both MT and LXX, which does not necessarily suggest a different Hebrew text at their base, but rather that they, too, had a difficult time with MT and tried to make sense out of it (without, however, showing any evidence of having had recourse to the OG).

If LXX's text was different from MT, it appears to have diverged only in a few words: וכן for וכן; the vocalization הָהָמָי for הָהָמָי; אֲשֶׁר שָׁמוּ (or אֲשֶׁר הָשָׁמוּ) for אֲנִי שָׁלָמִי, which makes it seem more likely that one or the other had become corrupt than that an entirely different reading had been present. Those who prefer LXX have shown the fittingness of the woman's words to Joab on this occasion. As Driver expresses it, "If one desired to find a place in which old Israelitish institutions were more strictly preserved, he was told to apply to Abel and to Dan: why should Joab seek to destroy a city that was thus true to its hereditary character and nationality?"<sup>90</sup>

It may be asked, however, if such reasoning was altogether fitting on this occasion. The inhabitants of Abel are under the immediate threat of attack by Joab because they are harboring Sheba within their walls. A woman, who had a reputation for great wisdom (cf. vv.16 and 22) was apparently deputed by the others to try to reason with Joab and to save the city from destruction. According to LXX, the brunt of her argument was that Joab should spare the city because it and another city called Dan had a reputation

---

88 "And she spoke saying, 'I remember now what is written in the book of the Torah, to inquire in the city in ancient times saying, "Was it not thus for you to ask in Abel whether (they) are peaceful?" We are peaceful in fidelity with Israel'."

89 "The woman said, 'They used to have a saying of old, that, consulting they consulted the prophets, and then they destroyed. I am requiting the laying waste of Israel'..."

90 Driver, p. 347.

for being faithful Israelite cities. It does not seem probable, however, that Joab, in hot pursuit of Sheba, was particularly interested in letting his quarry escape simply because of the reputation of a city. Further, it is in no way clear why Dan should be mentioned at this point.<sup>91</sup> In spite of the difficulties of MT, the "wisdom" of the woman seems to come through much more clearly there. She tells Joab that the old saying runs, "Ask in Abel and thus they accomplish it." Under the circumstances, this appears tantamount to saying, "No sooner said than done," for the woman has understood very well that Joab wants Sheba, not the destruction of the city. When he states the object of his quest, in v.21, the woman's immediate response is, "Behold, his head shall be thrown to you over the wall." In the context, that version seems more likely than the subtleties of reasoning which a secondary text appears to have imposed upon the LXX.

The second reading in LXX for וכן חתמו, וכן οὗτος εἰ ἐξελεῖτον, shows that even in the form apparently corrected toward MT the influence of OG was still present, which prevented the true meaning of MT to come through. Vg alone appears to have read entirely with MT: qui interrogant interrogant in Abela et sic perficiebant.

If MT yields the meaning most suited to the context here for the end of v.18, the same may not necessarily be true for the opening words of v.19. The puzzling אנכי אמה שלמי אמוני ישראל אמה may well be the result of a corruption which has left two plural constructs in a row, neither of which seems to fit with אנכי. Further, the אמה which begins the next clause would seem to require a waw here to join it with the preceding: LXX has supplied δε following ου, and OL et tu. Here the judgment of HOTTP would appear to be the

---

91 Klostermann refers to Judg 18:29, which in fact does mention the founding of the city of Dan, but there is nothing in this verse to suggest its reputation of fidelity to Israelite traditions. On the contrary, v.30 tells us that the Danites set up graven images for themselves.

most well founded: "Either the reading of the old Septuagint is the original one and MT is corrupt; or MT is corrupt but faithful in preserving at least the ruins of the original reading, while the Septuagint reading, aiming above all at a satisfactory meaning, facilitates and reconstructs the text. The second alternative is more probable."<sup>92</sup>

As far as the double reading is concerned, the OG appears to be attributable to a Vorlage which was different from MT, but which was a corruption of a text similar to MT.

## 2 Sam 20:22a

MT: ...וְהָיָה אֵל-כָּל-עַם הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל

LXX<sup>B</sup>: καὶ εἰσηλθεν ἡ γυνὴ πρὸς πάντα τὸν λαόν, καὶ ἐλάλησεν πρὸς πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτῆς.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἡ γυνὴ πρὸς πάντα τὸν λαόν, καὶ ἐλάλησεν πρὸς πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν κατὰ τὴν αὐτῆς φρονήσιν.

The LXX contains a plus here, this time occurring after the translation of MT. Aside from recensional differences in kaigé (εἰσηλθεν; σοφία), both it and Ant witness to the plus.<sup>93</sup> Wellhausen maintained that LXX contains a Duplette and preferred to read its text: וְהָיָה אֵל-כָּל-עַם הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל.<sup>94</sup> Thenius, Peters and Schulz would conserve both readings, the second, preserved in LXX, having fallen out through the similarity of endings אֵל-כָּל. Böttcher inserted וְהָיָה אֵל after וְהָיָה, blaming the absence of the phrase in MT on haplography from the first to the second אֵל.<sup>95</sup> Hertzberg would simply add וְהָיָה after עַם, maintaining that with the phrase "in her wisdom", some mention of speaking is necessary.<sup>96</sup> Driver took no side on the question, while Keil, Erdmann, Ehrlich, Hummelauer, RSV, NEB, NAB, BJ all follow MT.

92 HOTTP Preliminary Report, p. 258, which gives a grade of "B" to MT.

93 Mss o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> read εἰσπορεύθη for πορεύθη in b.

94 Wellhausen, p. 208, followed by Nowack and Kittel.

95 Followed by Klostermann, Budde, Dhorme, BJ<sup>1</sup>, Osty.



While Tg and Syr follow MT, Vg here reads Ingressa est ergo ad omnem populum et locuta est eis sapienter, which although it does not follow LXX exactly, may have been inspired by it.

It is difficult to see how, if one accepts the longer text of LXX, it could have resulted in that of MT. One must posit at one and the same time a misreading of תעיר for תע and a homeoteleuton at אל כל. The text proposed by Böttcher is more logical than either MT or LXX, and has the merit of explaining the MT form by a simple haplography from אל to אל. Against it, however, is the fact that to arrive at such a text based on LXX requires a complicated process of rather clumsy corrections on the level of the early Greek text. Hertzberg's solution of simply adding וחכר (cf. Vg) makes the text smoother, but he does not explain either how the present MT nor the present LXX could have arisen from such a reading.

Dhorme noted that with בחכמה, one would expect a verb of speaking.<sup>97</sup> It is possible, however, that LXX, confronted with וחכר, made the same reflection which inspired it to add the seemingly more logical verb here. At 1 Sam 17:43 and 45 we read בא-אלי במקלות and בא-אליך בשם יהוה respectively. The construction בוא followed by the preposition beth indicates that with which David was armed as he went against Goliath. In our text, the woman of Abel is "armed" with her wisdom, which suggests that וחכר is certainly well-placed here.

Wellhausen pointed out that at 2 Sam 14:4 for MT וחכר, LXX read וחכר (αὐτὸς ἐλάλῃ), just the opposite of the variant which we have in 20:22.<sup>98</sup> In 14:4, MT may well be disturbed, as another וחכר occurs later on in the verse precisely where one would expect it. In 20:22, however, וחכר, especially with beth preceding חכמה, makes perfectly good sense in its context as we saw above.

96 Hertzberg, p. 370, note e.

97 Dhorme, p. 415.

98 Wellhausen, p. 191.

If one accepts the longer LXX text as original, it would have been more logical to read "she came to the city and spoke to the people," and, in fact, many commentators suggest this modification.<sup>99</sup> This, however, does not correspond to LXX, which maintains MT's wording with *καὶ εἰσ-ηλθεν ἡ γυνὴ πρὸς πάντα τὸν λαόν*. If LXX or its Vorlage added the second member here, since the people had already been mentioned in the first, it may have added "to the whole city" to avoid repetition.

The plus in LXX cannot be accounted for by a double translation of the same Hebrew text as that of MT. Nor does it seem likely that it represents another, parallel tradition since its plus seems to imply knowledge of MT's form. The most probable solution here, therefore, is to see in the plus in LXX an expansion based on the context, in which LXX or its Vorlage wanted to fill out the shorter text as found in MT in order to specify the fact that the woman not only came in to the people, but also spoke to them.

## 2 Sam 21:15b-16a

MT: ...וַיָּשְׁבוּ בָנָב אֲשֶׁר בִּילִידֵי הַרפָּה.<sup>16a</sup> וַיַּעַף דָּוִד<sup>15b</sup>

LXX<sup>B</sup>: 15b *καὶ ἐπορευθῆ Λαυειδ*. 16a *καὶ Ἰεσβι ος ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἐκγονοῖς τοῦ Βαφα...*

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: 15b *καὶ ἐξελευθῆ Λαυιδ*. 16a *καὶ Λαδου υἱος Ἰωας ος ἦν ἐκ τῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν γιγαντῶν...*

In these verses which describe the attack of the Philistine giants on David and his men, neither cod B nor Ant corresponds exactly to MT. In addition, we find a text in Greek at the end of v.11 (at the end of v.10 in Ant and OL<sup>V</sup>) which reads *καὶ ἐξελευθῆσαν, καὶ κατέλαβεν αὐτοὺς Λαν υἱος Ἰωα ἐκ τῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν γιγαντῶν*, and which appears to be still another translation of vv.15b.16a. This form of the text is quoted by Origen as well, with the one exception that he reads *ἐλάβεν* for *κατέλαβεν*.<sup>100</sup> All commentators

99 Cf. Böttcher, Klostermann, Dhorme, BJ<sup>1</sup>, Osty.

100 Cited by Barthélemy, Les Devanciers, p. 137.

who take note of it recognize that the plus at v.11 belongs to vv.15b.16a.<sup>101</sup>

The text of MT for these verses is extremely problematic and none of the versions at vv.15b.16a offers an entirely satisfying alternative:

- MT: רשע וישבו בנג אש  
 LXX<sup>B</sup>: και επορευθη Δαυειδ και Ιεσβι ος ην  
 LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και εξελυθη Δαυιδ και Δαδου υιος Ιωας ος ην  
 Vg: deficiente autem David. Iesbidenob qui fuit  
 Tg: רשע וישבו בנג וי  
 Syr: wdhl dwyd wq'b w'byšh mn gnbr'  
 Jos:<sup>102</sup> και γενομενος εκλυτος ωφθη υπο τινος των  
 πολεμιων Ακμονος  
 LXX v.11: και εξελυθησαν και κατελαβεν αυτους Δαν υιος Ιωα  
 OL<sup>V</sup> et defecerunt et sustulit eos Dan filius Ioaz.

All witnesses are in agreement on the reading γγι/εξελυθη<sup>103</sup> (εξελυθησαν) against cod B επορευθη. It may be that the scribe of cod B misread εξελυθη as εξηλθεν or something similar, which was then transformed into kaigé επορευθη.<sup>104</sup> Wellhausen suggested that in the words γγι there was concealed the name of the Philistine of whom v.16 speaks and that a verb such as ηγι must have originally stood in the text here.<sup>105</sup> This, however, varies so widely from any known text that it seems to be an explanation out of desperation. The words γγι (or plural εξελυθησαν in v.11 LXX) are attested to by all the texts and seem to fit in well with the narrative. At 21:17 David's men tell him not to go out to battle any longer, which is a logical consequence of his weariness as described in v.15.

101 Thenius, Klostermann, Budde (KHAT), Smith, Dhorme, Schulz.

102 Josephus, Ant. VII, 298.

103 In all Greek mss except cod B.

104 Kaigé reads a form of πορευειν for OG ερχεσθαι or απερχεσθαι at 2 Sam 13:25.28; 15:14; 17:18.21.

105 Wellhausen, p. 210, followed by Nowack, Driver, Dhorme (1910), Smith.

The beginning of v.16, וישבו בנב אשר, on the other hand, is unintelligible. Cod B, Vg and Tg have translated literally, while Ant, καὶ Δαδου υἱος Ἰωας, seems to have been inspired by LXX v.11 to some extent, while retaining ος ην following MT and cod B. This suggests that Ant here contains not the OG but a later text, based partially on OG for v.11 and partially on cod B at v.16. Ehrlich suggested reading וישבו בנב, with בנב as the name of the Philistine challenger and וישבו from שבה, meaning "to win a victory over an opponent so that he must put down his weapon",<sup>106</sup> although Schulz has contested this meaning here and proposed that ויש was an abbreviation for ויהי איש.<sup>107</sup> Hertzberg, basing his reasoning on gnbr' in Syr, suggested ואיש גבור, "and there was warrior",<sup>108</sup> although in Syr this word refers to the giants, and it has another reading for v.16a (see above). It seems certain that MT is corrupt here, although none of these texts suggests a plausible emendation.<sup>109</sup>

Even though it has been widely displaced, the LXX plus at v.11 is probably the oldest Greek text here.<sup>110</sup> If it was originally found at v.16, the plural forms (εξελεuthσαν; αυτους) indicate that it refers not only to David, as in MT, but to his men as well, who are mentioned in v.15a.

Whether the Greek text of v.11 should be used to correct MT here or not is difficult to determine. As mentioned above, it yields a good sense in the context of v.16, although if a corruption occurred early on in the Hebrew text

106 Ehrlich, p. 331.

107 Schulz II, pp. 264 ff.

108 Hertzberg, p. 385.

109 Among the recent translations, all follow MT for v.15b. Then, for v.16a, RSV, Dhorme (1956), Osty and TOB read with MT; NEB: "Then Benob, one of the Rephaim..."; NAB: "Dodu, one of the Rephaim..."; BJ<sup>1</sup>: "Alors se dressa Dôdô, fils de Joash, un descendant de Rapha"; BJ<sup>3</sup>: "Il y avait un champion d'entre les descendants de Rapha"; Eü: "Und ein Rafaiter aus Gob...". Note that none of these translations uses the text of v.11b to correct v.16 here.

110 Cf. Barthélemy, Les Devanciers, p. 137, who based his conclusion on Origen's citation of the text in this form.

of Samuel, LXX's Vorlage may have been disturbed here as well and the OG form could be its own interpretation.<sup>111</sup> In any event, for the text of vv.15b-16a we have a probably corrupt MT, faithfully reproduced in kaigé while the OG has been dislocated by a second translation and preserved at the end of v.11. The text of Ant contains a form still later than kaigé, partially brought into conformity to it but partially influenced by OG.

### Conclusions

The cases considered here are by no means all the examples of double translation in the Greek mss of Samuel. They are, however, all cases of "significant pluses" in the text which show that a second translation has been inserted into the text.

The simplest cases are those in which the OG seems to preserve the same Hebrew text as MT, but had translated it differently, or more freely, where a later Greek edition inserted a rendering much closer to MT (1 Sam 15:3; 2 Sam 15:17 f.; 15:19 f.).

A number of cases indicate that the ancestor of OG's Vorlage was originally similar to MT, but the Vorlage itself contained a corruption which accounted for the divergent translation in OG (2 Sam 2:22; 15:34; 19:19).

One case has indicated that a Vorlage was the same as MT, but was at least partially misread or misunderstood by OG (1 Sam 1:6), and was re-translated in Ant.

Some indicate that the Vorlage was similar, but that either the Vorlage itself, or the OG translation, modified the text slightly in order to clarify or explain. This accounts for a slight expansion in 2 Sam 15:17 f., and for an additional explanatory clause in 1 Sam 3:21 and 2 Sam 20:22.

---

111 At 2 Sam 15:14, וְהִשְׁגִּנוּ is translated καὶ καταλαβὴ, which may be a clue that OG κατελαβεν in v.11 came from an original וישג (hiphil of נִשַּׁג), corrupted to וישבו in proto-MT, but this, as well as the other corrections suggested, remains in the realm of conjecture.

Finally, a certain number of these double translations indicate a corruption in the text of MT, where OG may witness to a more primitive form of the text (2 Sam 13:15 f.; 20:18 f.; 21:15 f.).

In most of these texts, the double translation is contained in all the Greek witnesses, although in 1 Sam 1:6 only Ant contains the plus, and in 2 Sam 15:19 f.; 18:18; 19:19, the text of Ant (here OG) does not contain the second reading. In two of the texts, 2 Sam 13:15 f. and 21:15 f., the original OG has been displaced to a position several verses away from its original location, or to a different part of the verse.

Thus, these double readings are due to a variety of causes, most having as their purpose, however, the desire to bring the Greek text closer to MT.

If we examine the way in which these second translations have been inserted into the text, we would expect a certain amount of duplication since they are, for the most part, translations of basically the same text. F. H. Woods has noted that "it frequently happens, however, that what at first sight look like omissions from [homeoteleuton] in the Hebrew prove, on closer examination, to be merely alternative renderings of the LXX, because, from the nature of the case, these alternatives generally begin or end with the same words as the clauses to which they correspond."<sup>112</sup>

The pluses which seem to follow this pattern most closely are found at 2 Sam 2:22, where the repetition of  $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$   $\text{I}\omega\alpha\beta$  in cod B surrounds the second translation, and at 2 Sam 18:18, where the second translation was inserted at  $\sigma\tau\eta\lambda\eta\nu$ , and ends on the same word. The fact that in both of these cases the second translation does not begin at the start of a syntactic unit, where one would expect a later editor to take up a fresh translation, suggests that a word

---

<sup>112</sup> F. H. Woods, "The Light Thrown by the Septuagint Version on the Books of Samuel," Studia Biblica (Oxford, 1885), pp. 21-38. See especially p. 27.

was purposely chosen in order to make the insertion fit more smoothly into the text. The result, however, is the creation of a kind of pseudo-homeoteleuton, such as Woods described.

That such a procedure was not confined to the insertion of a second translation into the Greek text, but may have been one of the techniques used in order to make other insertions into the text as well forms the hypothesis which will be examined in Part 2 of this study, where the pluses or minuses under consideration are not attributable to a second translation of the same text.

## P A R T II

## "HAPLOGENIC" PLUSES

2.0 The cases which will be examined in Part II each contain the same or similar words at the beginning and at the end of the phrases or sentences which appear as a plus in one of the forms of the text but which are absent from one or more of the other forms. In each case the longer text form containing the plus may be seen as presenting the material possibility of a scribal error which would account for the absence of the plus through homeoteleuton or homeoarcton. Such texts which contain this possibility and which could have generated such an error may be called "haplogenic", although each case must be examined individually in order to determine whether the shorter text indeed does witness to an error or whether the longer text shows evidence of a later addition.

2.1 "Haplogenic" pluses in LXX

The pluses examined in this section are haplogenic in form, which indicates that their LXX form suggests that an error due to homeoteleuton or homeoarcton accounts for their absence from MT.

1 Sam 1:24 f.

MT: <sup>24</sup>וַתַּעֲלֶה עִמָּה כֹּאשֶׁר גָּמְלָתוֹ בְּפָרִים שְׁלֹשָׁה וְאִיפָּה אַחַת קָמָה וְנָבַל יֶיִן  
וַתְּבַאֲהוּ בֵּית-יְהוָה שְׁלוֹ וְהַנֶּעֱר נֶעַר <sup>25</sup>וַיִּשְׁחַטוּ אֶת-הַפֶּר וַיִּבְיֹאוּ  
אֶת-הַנֶּעֱר אֶל-עֲלִי

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>24</sup>καὶ ἀνεβη μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰς Σηλωμ ἐν μοσχῶ τριετιζοντι  
καὶ ἀρτοῖς καὶ οἶφι σεμιδαλεως καὶ νεβελ οἶνου. καὶ  
εἰσηλθεν εἰς οἶκον Κυρίου ἐν Σηλωμ, καὶ τὸ παιδᾶριον  
μετ' αὐτῶν· καὶ προσηγάγον ἐνώπιον Κυρίου, καὶ ἐσφαξεν  
ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ τὴν θυσίαν ἣν ἐποιεῖ ἐξ ἡμερῶν εἰς  
ἡμέρας τῷ Κυρίῳ. καὶ προσηγάγεν τὸ παιδᾶριον, <sup>25</sup>καὶ  
ἐσφαξεν τὸν μοσχόν· καὶ προσηγάγεν Ἀννα ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ  
παιδᾶριου πρὸς Ἡλεὶ.



LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: 24 και ανεβη μετ'αυτου εις Σηλω εν μοσχω τριετιζοντι και αρτοις και οιφι σεμιδαλεως και νεβελ οινου, και εισηλθον εις του οικου Κυριου εν Σηλω, και το παιδαριον μετ'αυτων, 25 και προσηγαγον αυτον ενωπιον Κυριου. και εσφαξεν ο πατηρ αυτου την θυσιαν των ημερων ην εποiei εξ ημερων εις ημερας τω Κυριω. και προσηγαγον το παιδαριον και εσφαξαν τον μοσχον. και προσηλθεν Αννα η μητηρ του παιδαριου προς Ηλει.

4QSam<sup>a</sup>: 1 ותעל אותו שילה כאשר<sup>24</sup>  
 [ בפר כן ] בקר משלש ולחם [ ואיפה קמח ונבל יין ותבא בית ] יהוה שילה והנער  
 [ עמם ויבאו לפני יהוה וישחט אביו את ] הזב[ח] אשר  
 [ יעשה מימים בימים ליהוה ותבא את הנער ] 25 וי[שחט]  
 את הפר ותבא חנה עם הנער על עלי 26 ותאמר בי ] אנני

When Hannah brings the young Samuel to Shiloh to present him to Yahweh and to put him into Eli's service, LXX contains a considerable plus at the end of v.24, essentially present in 4Q as well, although this latter differs somewhat from LXX as we shall see below.

Thenius<sup>2</sup> was the first, and until the discovery of the text of 4Q, the only one to advocate acceptance of this plus as original, attributing its loss in MT to homeoteleuton from נער to הנער. The rest of the commentators have followed the opinion of Wellhausen, who pointed out that the Hebrew text of MT speaks of the sacrificial offering which accompanied the presentation of Samuel as an independent act, while LXX inserts it into the context of the yearly festal offering at Shiloh. Thus LXX gives major rôles to both Elkanah and Hannah while MT concentrates on Hannah almost exclusively. Wellhausen accordingly considered the plus to be an addition in LXX.<sup>3</sup>

The text of 4Q agrees with LXX against MT on a considerable number of points in addition to containing the plus:

1 F. M. Cross, BASOR 132, p. 26.

2 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, pp. 6 f.

3 Wellhausen, p. 41.

<u>4Q</u>		<u>LXX</u>		<u>MT</u>
ותעל	=	και ανεβη	≠	ותעלהו
אותו	=	μετ'αυτου	≠	עמה
שילה	=	εις Σηλωμ	≠	-----
בקר משלש	=	εν μοσχω τριετιζοντι	≠	בפרים שלשה
ולחם	=	και αρτοις	≠	-----
הזב[ח]	=	την θυσιαν	≠	-----
וישחט	=	και εσφαξεν	≠	וישחטו

After שילה כאשר, the beginning of the next line in 4Q is unfortunately missing and is not resumed until בקר משלש. Cross proposes reading בפר בן before these words, after the example of Lev 1:5 (אח-בן הבקר) and Num 15:9 (על-בן-הבקר) where LXX has τον μοσχον and επι του μοσχου respectively. From these two examples, however, the presence of בפר is not necessary to produce the translation εν μοσχω in LXX v.24. Just after that, however, משלש, clearly attested to in the fragment, may be the clue to an erroneous word division in MT which resulted in בפרים הלשה.<sup>4</sup> Even if one accepts Cross' בפר בן בקר, there is still a large space in the line which is difficult to account for if one follows either MT or LXX here. LXX εις Σηλωμ εν μοσχω κτλ. has nothing intervening, while in MT after כאשר there is only גמלוהו. Cross would eliminate this from the original text, claiming that it "crept in by vertical dittography."<sup>5</sup> He maintains that כאשר should introduce a reference to Elkanah's customary pilgrimage, and tentatively proposed לזנוח ליהוה in BASOR 132, but later suggested the restoration of שילה כאשר עלה אישה לזנוח ליהוה שילה, with the note that "LXX has suffered a haplography, the scribe's eye jumping from the

<sup>4</sup> This was suggested already by Driver, p. 20, and confirmed by E. A. Speiser ("The Nuzi Tablets Solve a Puzzle in the Books of Samuel," BASOR 72 [1938] 15-17), who suggested that "the reason for the wrong division must lie in the comparative obscurity, in post-biblical times, of the idiom which involved the use of the multiplicative adjective for an elliptical reference to age." (p. 16).

<sup>5</sup> Cross, BASOR 132, p. 19, note 17.

first שילה to the second שילה.<sup>6</sup> There is however, no textual support for either of these readings.

Cross, followed by Ulrich<sup>7</sup> and McCarter,<sup>8</sup> attributes the absence of the plus in MT haplography through homeoteleuton from הָנֶעַר to הָנֶעַר[ה]. "Both requirements of space, and the clear traces of hzbh k'sr (LXX Θυσίαν ην), as well [wy] šht in v.25 (l.10), make the full reading certain."<sup>9</sup> As for the enlarging of Elkanah's rôle in 4Q and LXX, Cross maintains that, since all traditions testify that he was present and since the events described probably took place at the regular pilgrim feast, it would be "methodologically unsound" to eliminate him (against Wellhausen).<sup>10</sup> He suggests that "the origin of the confusion was misunderstanding of an archaic verbal form: the tqtl construed with 3rd. person duals and masc. plurals in archaic biblical Hebrew..."<sup>11</sup> Thus, הָנֶעַר for example, could have meant "they (two)", and was misunderstood as a reference to Hannah alone.

A further observation of Cross' on the plus in 4Q and LXX is that it represents a conflate reading, evident in its highly repetitive nature. McCarter attempts to sort out the two texts which would have been conflated, and tentatively proposes the following: (A) wyb'w (so LXX<sup>L</sup>; LXX<sup>B</sup> wtb'; MT wtb'hw) byt yhw šylh whn'r 'mm wyšht 'byhw 't hzbh k'sr y'sh mymym ymymh lyhwh wtb' 't hn'r <'l 'ly>. (B) wyb'w lpny yhw wyšhtw (so MT, LXX<sup>L</sup>; LXX<sup>B</sup> 4QSam<sup>a</sup> wyšht) 't hpr wtb' hnh 't hn'r (cf. MT, Vulg; LXX<sup>B</sup> 'm hn'r) 'l 'ly", with the comment that "variant A is redundant in its reference to Shiloh and echoes vv.3 and 24 in content. Variant B is evidently the superior reading."<sup>12</sup>

6 Cited by McCarter, p. 56.

7 Ulrich, QTSJ, pp. 40f.

8 McCarter, p. 57.

9 Cross, BASOR 132, p. 19.

10 Cross, BASOR 132, p. 19.

11 Cross, BASOR 132, p. 20.

12 McCarter, p. 57.

This long presentation was necessary to show the most recent opinion concerning these two verses, namely that the text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> lies ultimately at the basis of both MT and LXX here. Its highly complicated nature, however, makes it seem less likely as an adequate explanation. One must see a conflated text (in 4Q and partially preserved in LXX and MT) from two hypothetical and non-specified sources, an archaic verb form which appears suddenly here and nowhere else in Samuel, a vertical dittography and then a long homeoteleuton in MT, and another homeoteleuton in LXX, coincidentally at the precise place where MT has suffered its vertical dittography!

An additional indication that the MT form is not to be explained simply through textual accident is the observation, repeated by Cross but already noticed by Wellhausen, that the MT assigns a major rôle in the proceedings to Hannah while in LXX and 4Q Elkanah shares a large part of the action. Such a change of emphasis would seem better explained through deliberate and conscious editorial activity. This, by itself, does not settle the question of whether the longer or the shorter form is more original, but, as we have already seen above, for 1 Sam 1:5 f. and 1:11,<sup>13</sup> the text of LXX contains several additions, whose absence from MT is not attributable to textual accident, which seem to have the purpose of enlarging the picture of Samuel as a Nazirite. The extra section here in vv.24-25, which places greater emphasis on the rôle of the sacrifice in the presentation of Samuel at Shiloh, appears to fit in well with these pluses in LXX.

Although the shorter MT form here has been accepted by almost all exegetes,<sup>14</sup> most have, at the same time, proposed correction of the difficult expression וְהָנֵס וְנָעַר which ends v.24 in MT. A survey of opinions shows the following

---

13 See pp. 12-18.

14 With the exception of Thenius, Cross, Ulrich and McCarter.

- proposed emendations: 1) והנער עמם, following LXX;<sup>15</sup>  
 2) change to והנער עמה and place it at the end of v.25;<sup>16</sup>  
 3) change to והנער עמה and leave it at the end of v.24;<sup>17</sup>  
 4) omit the two words altogether;<sup>18</sup> 5) read נער נער והנער;<sup>19</sup>  
 6) read נער צעיר, with the meaning, "the lad being little,";<sup>20</sup> 7) והנער נזיר;<sup>21</sup> 8) read with MT.<sup>22</sup>

Driver suggested that the expression might be understood in accordance with the Semitic usage as seen, for example in ויתהלכו באשר יתהלכו (1 Sam 23:13), in order to say more about him,"<sup>23</sup> although he himself did not accept this reading. A. Guillaume, however, has bolstered this argument in favor of MT by noting the Arabic construction والناس ناسق والبلاز يلاق, which he translates, "Les hommes sont des hommes excellents et le pays est un excellent pays."<sup>24</sup>

Zorell describes the use of נער here as "prae-dicative", and groups it with 1 Sam 17:33 (כי נער אתה), 17:42 (כי היה נער), 1 Kgs 3:7 (ואנכי נער קטון), 1 Chr 22:5 (כי נער אנכי), and Jer 1:6 (שלמה בני נער ורך).<sup>25</sup>

- 
- 15 Already Cappel proposed והנער עמם. והנער עמם was accepted by Kittel (BH<sup>1</sup> [1905]), Dhorme (1910), Fernandez, BJ<sup>1</sup> and Osty. Driver rejected it as tautologous.
- 16 Wellhausen, Driver<sup>1</sup> (1890), Budde (SBOT), Nowack, Kittel (BH<sup>3</sup>).
- 17 Klostermann, Budde (KHAT), Driver<sup>2</sup> (1913), although see below, suggestion number eight.
- 18 Löhr maintained that it was a dittography from והנער עמם, which was itself an addition from LXX.
- 19 Böttcher.
- 20 J. Kennedy, An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the Old Testament (Edinburgh, 1928), p. 100.
- 21 Stoebe, p. 99.
- 22 Keil, Erdmann, Schulz, Dhorme (1956), Hertzberg, RSV, NEB, BJ<sup>3</sup>, TOB, Eü.
- 23 Driver, p. 21.
- 24 A. Guillaume, "L'apport de la langue et des traditions arabes à l'interprétation de l'ancien testament," L'Antien Testament et l'Orient [Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia I] (Louvain, 1957), p. 116.
- 25 Zorell, s.v.

It may be added, in defense of MT, that none of the proposed emendations is particularly satisfying. 1), 2) and 3) all lead to tautologies since the child is already the object both of וְחַלְהוּ in v.24 and וַיְבִיאוּ in v.25. 5), 6) and 7) are possible emendations, but have no basis in any of the textual witnesses. MT, on the other hand, makes sufficiently good sense here.

It may be further pointed out that in the LXX form of these verses, the boy Samuel is almost incidental to the action. He is mentioned only three times, whereas he is referred to five times in MT. The LXX plus displaces the emphasis, as shown above, to Elkanah's sacrifice and away from the child.

Because of the coherence of MT as it stands, of the fact that no simple textual accident is sufficient to explain the differences between MT, LXX and 4Q, and of the relative homeogeneousness of the LXX additions here and in the surrounding verses, it seems advisable to accept MT as the more primitive form of the text.

If MT נָעַר הַנָּעִר is accepted as the reading here, it is clear that the LXX plus could not have fallen out through an accident due to homeoteleuton, for, if that had been the case, then one of the occurrences of נָעַר should have disappeared as well. The plus in LXX (and in 4Q) extends from το παιδραριον in v.24 to το παιδραριον in v.25. If this is truly an addition, then it appears that an editor has taken advantage of the repeated נָעַר precisely in order to make his insertion here. The resultant text in LXX then has the appearance of being "haplogenic" since the same word stands at the beginning and at the end of the plus. The presence of the plus in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> most probably indicates that the addition was already present in LXX's Vorlage but, as has been shown above, it is not to be considered part of the original text.

1 Sam 3:15

MT: וישכב שמואל עד-הבקר ויפתח את-דלתות בית-יהוה

LXX<sup>B</sup><sub>Ant</sub>: και κοιμαται Σαμουηλ εως πρωι, και ωρθρισεν το πρωι  
και ηνοιξεν τας θυρας οικου Κυριου.

In this verse which describes Samuel's activity after the Lord has called him in the night, LXX makes explicit the fact that "he got up in the morning" before opening the doors of the house of the Lord. The plus, which presumes as original בִּקְר וישכב, has been accepted as original by a large majority of commentators,<sup>26</sup> who suggest that the plus fell out of the text accidentally because of homeoteleuton at בִּקְר-. Some, however, and most of the recent translations accept the shorter MT as original.<sup>27</sup>

This plus in LXX is one of a number of short pluses in the form of homeoteleuton whose originality in the text is extremely difficult to decide. On the one hand, the plus is not lengthy and the repetition of πρωι in the LXX indicates the possibility of haplography. All the Greek mss without exception, plus OL<sup>b</sup> contain the plus. On the other hand, however, the LXX or its Vorlage may have decided that between the statements that "Samuel lay down until morning," and "He opened the doors of the house of the Lord," it was necessary to fill in what MT left unsaid in its more laconic and elliptical narrative style.<sup>28</sup> Vg, Tg and Syr follow MT's shorter text.

We have already seen examples of this elliptical style of MT in Part I of this study. Another example which is closer in content to our verse here is found at 1 Sam 1:18 f. In 1:18, after Hannah has found favor in the Lord's eyes and sets out on her return from Shiloh, MT reads

26 Thenius, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Driver, Budde, Peters, Dhorme, Smith, Ehrlich, Nowack, McCarter, NAB.

27 Hummelauer, Schulz, Hertzberg, Kittel, Stoebe, BHS, RSV, NEB, BJ, Osty, TOB, Eü.

28 Cf. Stoebe, who refers to the plus as being "im Rahmen der üblichen Erweiterungen bei G" (p. 122).

וּחֹלֶךְ הָאִשָּׁה לְדֹרְכָה, while LXX adds εἰς τὸ καταλῦμα αὐτῆς. Then, in v.19, we are told that וַיִּשְׁכְּמוּ בַּבֹּקֶר, although the text does not explicitly state that they lay down the night before. Thus, the original narrative may leave certain actions unsaid, while the LXX witnesses to a text which has a tendency to fill in these gaps. If, however, the original text of 3:15 read, "He lay down until morning and got up in the morning," it would appear overly repetitive and loaded down. On the other hand, if it read, "He lay down and got up in the morning," the occasion of a haplography would no longer be present.

This text has not been found among the fragments of the Samuel scrolls "a", "b", or "c" from Qumran, but another text from Cave IV, 4Q160, designated by J. Allegro as "The Vision of Samuel",<sup>29</sup> contains 1 Sam 3:14-17 and, for our verse, provides us with the following text:

[שְׁמוּאֵל שָׁכַב לַלַּיְלָה עַלִּי וַיִּקָּם וַיִּפְתַּח אֶת־דַּלְתוֹ]

At first glance, the presence of וַיִּקָּם would seem to indicate that this text is similar to LXX. For LXX σπθριζειν, however, קום lies at its base only at Dan 6:19. Out of forty-seven occurrences of σπθριζειν, שָׁכַם hiphil lies at its base thirty-nine times and שָׁחַר piel six times.<sup>30</sup> It is highly unlikely, therefore, that σπθριζειν in LXX 1 Sam 3:15 represents an original קום in the text such as we find at Qumran. The absence of הִנָּקַר in 4Q160 further shows the lack of direct dependence upon either MT or LXX. This text seems to have reacted in a similar way to LXX adding the note that "he arose" in order to fill in what the Biblical narrative passed over.

While recognizing the possibility of a haplography through homeoteleuton at 3:15, it seems more probable that the LXX plus is an explanatory addition to the text. Because

29 J. Allegro, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan V: Qumrân Cave 4 (Oxford, 1968), p. 9.

30 שָׁחַר piel occurs at Job 7:21; 8:5; Pss 62:1; 77:34; Hos 6:1; Isa 26:9. Elsewhere, including universally throughout the Pentateuch and the Historical Books, שָׁכַם is at the base of σπθριζειν.



of the form in LXX, with the repetition of *πρωι*, it is possible that an editor who wished to make the insertion was inspired by the mention of *πρωι* (or *בֶּקֶר* if the addition took place on the level of the *Vorlage*) in order to add his clarifying addition *και ωρθρισεν το πρωι*, thus creating a text which appeared to be "haplogenic" in form, but which, in reality, contained an addition to MT's shorter text.

# 1 Sam 10:1

MT: וַיִּקְרָא שָׁמוּאֵל אֶת-כָּל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּשְׁקָהוּ וַיֹּאמֶר הֲלוֹא כֵּן-  
יְהוָה יִהְיֶה לָּנוּ לְגַדְלָנוּ

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ελαβεν Σαμουηλ τον φακον του ελαιου και επεχεεν επι την κεφαλην αυτου, και επιλησεν αυτον και ειπεν αυτω Ουχι κεχρικεν σε Κυριος εις αρχοντα επι τον λαον αυτου, επι Ισραηλ; και συ αρξεις εν λαω Κυριου, και συ σωσεις αυτον εκ χειρος εχθρων αυτου κυκλοθεν. και τουτο σοι το σημειον οτι εχρισεν σε Κυριος επι κληρονομιαν αυτου εις αρχοντα.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ελαβεν Σαμουηλ τον φακον του ελαιου και κατεχεεν επι την κεφαλην αυτου. και επιλησεν αυτον και ειπεν αυτω οτι Κεχρικε σε Κυριος εις αρχοντα επι τον λαον αυτου, τον Ισραηλ, και συ αρξεις εν τω λαω Κυριου και σωσεις αυτον εκ χειρος των εχθρων αυτου κυκλοθεν. και τουτο σοι το σημειον οτι κεχρικεν σε Κυριος εις αρχοντα επι την κληρονομιαν αυτου.

In this verse which tells of the anointing of Saul by Samuel, LXX contains a considerable plus in which Samuel prophesies that Saul will be the savior of the people, and in which he specifies that a sign will show that the Lord has anointed him. The majority of commentators has accepted the originality of the plus here, attributing its loss in MT to haplography from the first to the second *יהוה ינהיגנו*.<sup>31</sup> Houbigant had already noted its absence from MT, although he maintained that only the latter part of the plus, *και ταυτο σοι το σημειον οτι εχρισεν σε Κυριος επι κληρονομιαν αυτου εις αρχοντα*, was to be considered as original to the text,

31 Thenius, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Driver, Budde, Smith, Nowack, Peters, Kittel, Dhorme, Fernandez, Schulz, McCarter, and virtually all the modern translations, with the exception of TOB.

in order to provide the introduction to vv.2-7 where the sign that the Lord has anointed Saul is described.<sup>32</sup>

The plus was rejected by Keil as a gloss which came from 1 Sam 9:16 f.<sup>33</sup> He notes further that the plus speaks of only one sign, whereas in the vv.2-6 there are three mentioned. Stoebe refers to the plus here as "a characteristic attempt to harmonize traditions which in M are still unbalanced,"<sup>34</sup> and maintains that LXX here followed a different recension which "in almost tedious verbosity removes all the difficulties."<sup>35</sup> HOTTP rejected the plus, giving MT a grade of "C", with the comment that "the allusive style of the MT should be noted here..., a style which the Septuagint or its Vorlage did not always respect in their efforts to make the text more explicit."<sup>36</sup> Barthélemy, after admitting that a basis for homeoarcton does exist, notes that "the committee, not without hesitation, recognized in this 'plus' an insertion whose contents join the context by the repetition of a word which has served as the occasion for the insertion."<sup>37</sup>

Thus, while the majority has accepted this plus as authentic in the text, the opinion is not entirely unanimous, and a certain number of indications should make us cautious in accepting this plus too quickly.

The repetition of material found in the neighboring verses, already pointed out by Keil, may point to the artificiality of this text. V.16 (και χρῖσταις αυτον εις αρχοντα επι τον λαον μου Ισραηλ και σωσει τον λαον μου εκ χειρος αλλοφυλων) and v.17 (ουτος αρξει εν τω λαω μου) are reproduced almost verbatim in LXX 10:1. The mention of the "sign",

---

32 Houbigant, p. 298, followed by Löhr, who called the rest of the plus "füglich, auch an dieser Stelle entbehrlich" (p. 46).

33 Keil p. 71, note 1, followed by Vercellone, Erdmann, Hummelauer, Graetz, Stoebe, HOTTP.

34 Stoebe, p. 197.

35 Stoebe, p. 197.

36 HOTTP Preliminary Report, pp. 165 f.

37 Barthélemy, CTAT.

which Houbigant considered original even though he called into question the rest of the plus, occurs in 10:7, which could easily have inspired an editor, wanting to introduce this confirmation of Saul's choice as king, to insert a reference to the sign here at 10:1.

Although an accident through haplography has been invoked as the reason for this omission in MT, a careful examination of the text shows that, in a true haplography,  $\text{כי}$  should have fallen out as well. Further, the expression  $\text{הָלוֹא כִי}$ , which Houbigant, Thenius, Wellhausen and Dhorme objected to on the grounds that the construction is not good Hebrew, occurs again at 2 Sam 13:28. In this latter location, the expression is passed over in silence by all and therefore, presumably, is an acceptable Hebrew construction.<sup>38</sup>

Where 10:1 speaks of Saul as  $\text{נָגִיד}$  over the Lord's heritage, MT exhibits an unusual and unique word order:  $\text{עַל-נִחְלָתוֹ לְנָגִיד}$ . Elsewhere where  $\text{נָגִיד}$  occurs, it always precedes that over which the "prince" rules (Cf.  $\text{נָגִיד עַל-הָעָם}$  [ל] at 1 Sam 9:16; 13:14; 25:30; 2 Sam 5:2 [= 1 Chr 11:2]; 6:21; 7:8 [= 1 Chr 17:7]; 1 Kgs 14:7; 16; 2 Chr 6:5). While MT's order is faithfully preserved in LXX ( $\text{\epsilon\pi\iota κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἀρχοντά}$ <sup>39</sup>), the plus contains the standard, expected word order, which may indicate mere imitation of the standard formula when it was added to the shorter text. The expression  $\text{עַל-נִחְלָתוֹ לְנָגִיד}$  is equally unique in that it is the only occurrence of these two words together in the entire Bible (at 9:16 the usual formula  $\text{עַל-נָגִיד}$  is used).

The repetition of  $\text{\epsilon\pi\iotaχρῆσεν σ\epsilon Κυριος}$  in LXX, with the accompanying repetition of the elements found in 9:16 f., seems to place greater emphasis on the anointing of Saul and on its significance within the context of the nascent kingship in Israel. That LXX emphasizes this anointing more than MT

38 Driver alone points to 13:28, to show that the construction is at least admissible (pp. 77 f.).

39 The Ant text (mss b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>) apparently saw the anomaly here, for it reads  $\text{\epsilonἰς ἀρχοντά ἐπὶ τὴν κληρονομία αὐτοῦ}$ .

is seen as well in 1 Sam 11:15 where, for MT וימלכו שם, ליקח-הם LXX reads και εχρισεν Σαμουηλ εκει τον Σαουλ εις βασιλεια. Thenius along suggested that LXX might be original here, while all the other commentators read with MT. It is possible here, to discern a desire on the part of LXX to give greater emphasis both to Samuel's rôle as well as to the anointing itself, perhaps in order to establish a parallel with the double anointing of David at 2 Sam 2:4 and 5:3.<sup>40</sup>

The result of this examination is, therefore, that while the possibility for omission of the plus (through scribal carelessness) exists, its contents add nothing new to the narrative and are, in fact, suspiciously similar to the surrounding verses. The MT makes good sense here, both contextually and grammatically, while LXX serves to lay greater emphasis on the anointing of Saul and on his subsequent rôle by introducing a substantial plus precisely at the words which it seeks to emphasize -- משה יהיה --, which appears to have created a text whose repetitiousness can be described as "haplogenic" in form, but which attests to a later scribal insertion.

#### 1 Sam 10:21

MT: ויקרנ את-שבת בנימו למשפחתו ולכל משפחת המטרי וילכד שאול  
בן-קיש ויבקשהו ולא נמצא

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και προσγει σκηπτρον Βενιαμειν εις φυλας, και κατακληρουται φυλη Ματταρει· και προσαγουσιν την φυλην Ματταρει εις ανδρας, και κατακληρουται Σαουλ υιος Κεις. και εξητει αυτον, και ουκ ευρισκετο.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και προσηγαγεν την φυλην Βενιαμιν κατα πατριας. και κατακληρουται πατρια Αματταρι. και προσηγαγεν την πατριαν Αματταρι κατα ανδρα ενα. και κατακληρουται Σαουλ υιος Κεις. και εξητει αυτον, και ουκ ευρισκετο.

The MT form of the lot-casting process conducted by Samuel which chose Saul as king of Israel lacks a logical step, the "bringing near" of the family of Matri, which is found in LXX<sup>B</sup>, and with only slight variation, in LXX<sup>Ant</sup>.

<sup>40</sup> Erdmann, p. 156; Klostermann, p. 36.

McCarter suggests that the original Hebrew phrase here, *ויקרב את משפחת מטרי לגברים*, fell out through haplography, and that the then meaningless *לגברים* was subsequently lost from the text.<sup>41</sup> Aside from the rather general hypothesis of Budde's that the sentence was "overlooked by M on account of similarity,"<sup>42</sup> no other author offers a suggestion as to how the words may have fallen out of MT, although the majority accepts the longer LXX form as necessary to complete the lot-casting process.<sup>43</sup>

Keil claimed that the plus is an addition, but an erroneous one, since, if one follows the parallel lot-casting scene in Josh 7, where the lot-casting proceeds from *שנט* to *משפחה* to *בית* and then *לגברים*, the *משפחת המטרי* should not be brought forward "*ατ'ανδρας*", but rather "*ατ'οικους*" -- *לבתים*.<sup>44</sup> Erdmann saw in the shorter MT form an abridgment of the fuller formula such as found in Josh 7, but this shorter form already existed as such in the original text.<sup>45</sup> Schulz pointed out the plural *προσαγεουσιν* (*προσηγαγεν* in *b o z(mg) c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>*), as opposed to the singular *ויקרב* as a sign of the unauthenticity of the plus.<sup>46</sup> For Stoebe, LXX here follows a different recension, one which has filled out the more laconic MT narrative.<sup>47</sup>

It seems undeniable that, if one follows the lot-casting process described in Josh 7:14-18, which determines Achan as the guilty party who had introduced idols into Israel's midst, a fuller, more detailed text would be desirable in 1 Sam 10:20 f. An elementary problem which prevents us

---

<sup>41</sup> McCarter, p. 190.

<sup>42</sup> Budde (SBOT), p. 59.

<sup>43</sup> Thenius, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Nowack, Budde, Smith, Kittel, Driver, Peters, Dhorme, Hertzberg, McCarter, RSV, NEB, BJ.

<sup>44</sup> Keil, p. 79, note 1.

<sup>45</sup> Erdmann, p. 144. Cf. also HOTTP.

<sup>46</sup> Schulz I, p. 155.

<sup>47</sup> Stoebe, p. 213, Cf. also Barthélemy, CTAT. NAB, TOB and Eü follow the shorter MT as well.

from forming a true picture of the scene in which Saul emerged as king is our lack of knowledge of the precise way in which the lot-casting process worked in ancient Israel, although the shorter MT might actually fit better in the specific context here.

As seen both in Josh 7 and 1 Sam 10:20 f., the structure of the lot-casting consisted in a series of ויקרב followed by וילכד, which progressively eliminates and narrows down the group upon which the lot falls. The process in Josh 7 goes through all the steps leading to the choice of one man, but in 1 Sam, as Keil has pointed out, steps are skipped, even in the LXX form, in order to arrive immediately at the designation of Saul.

The procedure that is described in Josh 7 is not entirely free from confusion either. The description of the process given by the Lord to Joshua in 7:14 is clear: the troops are brought forward according to שבט, then משפחה, then בנים, and finally לגברים, which permits the designation of one individual. In Josh 7:16-18, however, a certain amount of confusion is introduced by ויקרב את-משפחת יהודה in v.17a, where one expects either שבט יהודה or simply למשפחות. Then, in v.17b, לבנים should appear instead of לגברים.<sup>48</sup> LXX in fact seems to have noticed the problem in v.17a, as cod B reads ατα δημους in place of את-משפחת יהודה. For 17b-18, however, where MT has ונקרב את-משפחת הזרואי<sup>17b</sup> לגברים וילכד זבדי<sup>18</sup> ויקרב את-ביתו לגברים וילכד עכן... LXX reads simply ααι προσεχθη ατα ανδρα,<sup>18</sup> ααι ενεδειχθη Αχαρ...<sup>49</sup>

<sup>48</sup> Kennicott cod 253 reads לבנים here, as does Syr: lbtyn.

<sup>49</sup> The Greek ms variants for these two verses are numerous. Cf. Brooke-McLean, The Old Testament in Greek, Vol. I, Part IV. Joshua, Judges and Ruth (Cambridge, 1917). Max Margolis, in his edition of The Book of Joshua in Greek (Paris, 1931), restores the text as follows: 17ααι προσεχθη ατα δημους, ααι ενεδειχθη δημος Ζαραει· ααι προσεχθη ααι οισαους, ααι ενεδειχθη οισος Ζαμρει· 18ααι προσεχθη ατα ανδρα, ααι ενεδειχθη Αχαρ υιος Ζαμρει υιου Ζαρα.

Without pretending to solve the textual problem here in Josh 7:17 f., these texts show sufficiently that the textual confusion attendant upon the lot-casting process is not limited to 1 Sam 10:21, which may not be simply coincidental, but rather an indication of the general confusion which surrounds the texts dealing with lot-casting.<sup>50</sup>

Following the lot-casting of Josh 7 and 1 Sam 10, an essential element seems to have been the "bringing near" of the parties whose lot was to be decided. Since Saul's being absent when the lot fell upon him was essential to the narrative, however, the ויקרב could not be applied to the series in which he was chosen. The LXX, or its Vorlage, anxious to preserve the canonical progression of the lot-casting, may have lost sight of this when it introduced the complementary sentence into the text.

We have seen that a simple accident cannot account for the MT here, as McCarter showed that additional editorial activity must be posited in order to arrive at MT's shorter text if LXX had been original. The plus, through the repetition of המטרי, gives the appearance that scribal carelessness was involved in its omission from MT, but here again an editor may have used the name as a springboard in order to insert the plus intended to smooth out the text by providing the missing group. MT presents here a lectio brevior et difficilior, but one which nevertheless is understandable in the context. LXX had all the elements it needed, from the context of 10:20 f. and from Josh 7, to supply what was seen as necessary to conform the text to the usual lot-casting process.

#### 1 Sam 12:8

MT: כאשר-בא יעקב מצרים ויזעקו אבותיכם אל-יהוה...

LXX<sup>B</sup>: ως εισηλθεν Ιακωβ και οι υιοι αυτου εις Αιγυπτον, και εταπεινωσεν αυτους Αιγυπτος· και εβοησαν οι πατερες ημων (υμων Ant) προς Κυριον

---

50 See more at 1 Sam 14:41.

<sup>a</sup> 51  
4QSam :

כאש"ר בא יעקב ובניו מצרים ויענום מצרים ויזעקו  
[אבו]תִּיכֶם אֵל יְהוָה

When Samuel mentions the oppression in Egypt as part of his discourse on the establishment of a king in Israel, LXX, and apparently 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, register two small pluses,  $\alpha\lambda\iota \sigma\iota \upsilon\lambda\omicron\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ , and  $\alpha\lambda\iota \epsilon\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  ΑΙΥΠΤΟΣ. The originality of both of them has been accepted by only a few authors,<sup>52</sup> while the majority accepts the second but considers  $\alpha\lambda\iota \sigma\iota \upsilon\lambda\omicron\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  to be an insertion based on the parallel text at Josh 24:4,<sup>53</sup> or simply to be omitted as not necessary to the verse.<sup>54</sup> Many, however, have preferred to read with the shorter MT here.<sup>55</sup>

In addition to the fact that the second of these pluses presented the material possibility for having fallen out through homeoteleuton, at ΑΙΥΠΤΟΣ, it has been seen as necessary to the sense, acting as a justification for the following ויזעקו --the oppression in Egypt was the reason for the cries of the fathers.<sup>56</sup> As far as the first plus is concerned, the simple mention of "and his sons" with Jacob, the text of Josh 24:4 ("But Jacob and his sons went down to Egypt") does indeed seem to present itself as a ready parallel, especially since the circumstances surrounding the two passages are so similar. In both cases all Israel is gathered to hear its leader recall its past history and to establish a new political unity. Schulz has pointed out, however, that in the Greek text, the αὐτοὺς in the second plus requires  $\alpha\lambda\iota \sigma\iota \upsilon\lambda\omicron\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  as an antecedent.<sup>57</sup> Others

51 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 53.

52 Thenius, Budde, Dhorme (1910), Kittel, NEB, NAB.

53 Cf. Budde (KHAT), p. 79.

54 Wellhausen, Graetz, Nowack, Driver, Smith, Peters, Fernandez, Dhorme (1956), McCarter, RSV, Osty, BJ, Eü.

55 Keil, Erdmann, Klostermann, Hummelauer, Ehrlich, Löhr, Schulz, Hertzberg, Stoebe, BHS, HOTTP, TOB.

56 Cf. Thenius<sup>2</sup>, p. 47.

57 Schulz I, p. 68. Dhorme (p. 102) rejects as well the notion that Jacob is a collective which justifies the plurals.



(Nowack and McCarter) see Jacob here as a collective which would justify the plural αὐτοῦς. Although this is theologically possible, the name of Jacob, either with a plural verb or used in any other way which would suggest that it was considered as a collective noun in this sense, is never found elsewhere in the Hebrew text. It is much more probable, therefore, that the two pluses stand or fall together. Although the conditions are present for an apparent textual accident with the second of these, such is not the case for the first, nor is it probable that, if the second had fallen out, the first would have been removed. "And his sons" would make perfect sense in the context even if the second plus were not present.

An explanatory addition of this type, based partially on a similar text found elsewhere and partially on the desire to illuminate a shorter text more fully, is far from uncommon in LXX.<sup>58</sup> As MT stands, the simple mention of the sojourn in Egypt would be sufficient to evoke the response that "And your fathers cried out to the Lord," as Egypt was a sufficiently common reference-point for oppression. The presence of וַיִּזְעֻקוּ, therefore, hardly needs καὶ ἐπαλειψάσεν αὐτοῦς Αἴγυπτος as a justification. Because MT here is sufficient as it stands, and because the two pluses are tied together logically and grammatically and there is no reason to suspect an accident which would have occasioned the absence of the first of them, it is more probable here that these pluses are explanatory additions intended to fill out the text. That they appear to have been present in the text of 4Q as well is an indication that they were to be found already in LXX's Hebrew Vorlage. Αἴγυπτος here seems to have served as the word around which an editor constructed his insertion so that the resultant text appears in a "haplogenic" form although it is not to be considered as original.

---

58 Perhaps the plus was found already in its Vorlage; cf. Stoebe, who calls the pluses here "schriftgelehrte Erweiterung der pedantischen Rezension" (p. 233).

1 Sam 13:5

MT: ...וַיִּשְׁלַח יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת-רֹאשֵׁי הָאָרֶץ

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και οι αλλοφυλοι συναγονται εις πολεμον επι Ισραηλ, και αναβαινουσιν επι Ισραηλ τριακοντα χιλιαδες αρματων.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και οι αλλοφυλοι συναγονται εις πολεμον προς τον Ισραηλ, και αναβαινουσιν επι τον Ισραηλ τρεις χιλιαδες αρματων.

The short plus in LXX here has not enjoyed the same success as the preceding one at 12:8. Most commentators pass over και αναβαινουσιν επι Ισραηλ in silence, and even Thenius, who attributed its absence from MT to homeoteleuton in his first edition, abandoned it in the second. Peters, Dhorme (although he, too, read with MT in his later translation, in 1956), and McCarter have suggested an original וַיִּשְׁלַח עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל here, but all others either read with MT or make no comment on the text.

The plus adds little to the text beyond specifying the logical action on the part of the Philistines after having mustered their forces. Its presence, besides giving the impression of having been inspired by 1 Sam 7:7, serves simply to overload the text, and seems to fall in line with the tendency already noted in LXX to complete what is left unsaid in the shorter MT. The repetition of επι Ισραηλ (although Ant reads προς τον Ισραηλ the first time and then agrees with cod B επι the second, suggesting that it merely copied from the Greek text), while it could have occasioned the omission in MT, appears to be the sign that an editor took advantage of the mention of Ισραηλ in order to make his insertion.

1 Sam 13:15

MT: וַיִּקַּם שְׂמוּאֵל וַיַּעַל מִן-הַגִּלְגָּל בְּנֶעַת בְּנִימִן וַיִּפְקֹד שְׂאוּל אֶת-הָעָם הַנִּמְצְאִים עִמּוֹ כַּשֵּׁשׁ מֵאוֹת אִישׁ

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ανεστη Σαμουηλ και απηλθεν εκ Γαλγλων εις οδον  
 αυτου· και το καταλειμμα του λαου ανεβη οπισω Σαουλ  
 εις απαντησιν οπισω του λαου του πολεμιστου. αυτων  
 παραγενομενων εκ Γαλγαλων εις Γαβα Βενιαμιν, και  
 επεσκεψατο Σαουλ τον λαον τον ευρεθεντα μετ'αυτου  
 ως εξακοσιους ανδρας.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ανεστη Σαμουηλ και απηλθεν εκ Γαλγαλων εις την  
 οδον αυτου, και το καταλειμμα του λαου ανεβη οπισω  
 Σαουλ εις απαντησιν οπισω του λαου του πολεμιστου.  
 αυτων δε παραγενομενων εις Γαβα βουνον Βενιαμιν εκ  
 Γαλγαλων, και επεσκεψατο Σαουλ τον λαον τον ευρε-  
 θεντα μετ'αυτου, ως εξακοσιους ανδρας.

The problem with the MT form of this verse is one of coherence within its context. In v.15a, the MT tells us that Samuel went up from Gilgal to Gibeath Benjamin, and in v.15b Saul simply numbers the troops who were with him. In this text two anomalies seem to exist. First, Samuel disappears from the story at this point, not to appear again until 15:1, and is never mentioned anywhere else to have any relationship with Gibeath Benjamin. The town, is however, connected with Saul and with Jonathan (cf. 1 Sam 13:2.3; 14:2.16). Secondly, v.16 tells us that Saul and Jonathan were in Geba while nothing in MT informs us of their going to that place. In this instance, LXX provides a text which clears up both of these difficulties, as Samuel goes simply "on his way", while the rest of the people follow Saul to Gibeath Benjamin.

Already Houbigant blamed the omission of this plus on haplography caused by homeoteleuton, when a scribe's eye passed from the first גִּלְגָּל-בְּנִימִן to the second.<sup>59</sup> Before him, Clericus had seen the difficulty in the text, but instead of reading with LXX simply added ubi to his translation, giving "Tum surrexit Samuel, abiitque Gilgala Gibam Benjaminis, ubi Saul recensuit copias, etc."<sup>60</sup> Only a small number of authors

59 Houbigant, pp. 304 ff., followed by Thenius, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Löhr, Driver, Budde, Nowack, Peters, Smith, Dhorme, Fernandez, Schulz, Kittel, Hertzberg, McCarter, NEB, NAB, BJ, Osty, HOTP.

60 Clericus, p. 216.

has accepted the originality of the shorter MT here.<sup>61</sup>

The plus is attested to in all the Greek mss, although a slightly different word order is found in b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>: εἰς Γαββα βουνον Βενιαμιν εκ Γαλγαλων. OL<sup>V</sup> contains the plus as well (see below), while Vg, Tg and Syr read with MT.

Stoebe called the plus a "schwerfällige Erweiterung", and excluded it because it harmonizes the tension in the text caused by the coming together of two narrative units,<sup>62</sup> while Vercellone had rejected it because its meaning is "obscurus atque implexus".<sup>63</sup>

While the plus has been almost universally accepted, a closer examination reveals a certain number of points which make it impossible to accept a literal retroversion. Thenius gave his Hebrew version as: ויתר העם עלה אחריו שאול לקראת אחרי עם המלחמה והמה באים מן-הגלגל ...<sup>64</sup> He thus overlooked the difficulty of καὶ ἀπηλθεν εκ Γαλγαλων εἰς οδον αὐτου as a translation of ויעל מן-הגלגל, as well as the problematic εἰς ἀπαντησιν οἰσω τον λαου, an expression as awkward in Greek as in Thenius' Hebrew version. Wellhausen suggested that εἰς οδον αὐτου had fallen out of the text, and that οἰσω here was to be eliminated.<sup>65</sup> Klostermann maintained that לירכו was necessary in the text after מן-הגלגל, and that it fell out accidentally along with the rest of the plus. For the difficult οἰσω, he suggested that an erroneous οἰσω λαου had crept into the text as a variant of οἰσω Σαουλ, which separated εἰς ἀπαντησιν from its original object, του πολεμου. The presence of this extra λαου would then occasioned the modification to the adjectival πολεμιστου. He proposed, therefore, an original ויתר העם עלה אחריו שאול לקראת המלחמה.<sup>66</sup> This theory, however, seems too complicated to be a likely solution to the text.

61 Hummelauer, Vercellone, Ehrlich, Stoebe, BHS, RSV, TOB.

62 Stoebe, p. 245.

63 Vercellone, Variae Lectiones II, p. 234.

64 Thenius<sup>1</sup> p. 47.

65 Wellhausen, p. 83.

66 Klostermann, p. 42.

Driver claimed that *εις οδον αυτου* -- לדרך -- presumed a form of הלך with it, and accordingly proposed ויעל מן-הגלגל וילך לדרך,<sup>67</sup> which Smith accepted with the observation that "probably ויעל of H is not original (not represented by G) and was inserted after the loss of this sentence."<sup>68</sup> In favor of an original וילך is not only the *εις οδον αυτου*, but *απηλθεν* as well. *Απερχομαι* is used to translate עלה at Josh 10:36, 2 Chr 16:3 and Jer 21:2 only, while הלך lies behind it some 133 times in LXX. There is, however, no discernible reason why וילך should have been modified to ויעל even if the plus is authentic and fell out by accident. The fact that *ανεβη* occurs later in the text, in the LXX plus section, may be an indication, however, that *απηλθεν* was a change made in the Greek in order to avoid the repetition.

As far as *εις απαντησιν οπισθ του λαου του πολεμιστου* is concerned, the majority of authors has followed Wellhausen in considering *οπισθ* an inner-Greek corruption,<sup>69</sup> and read *לקרא עם המלחמה*. Ewald had proposed reading an original *לקרב* for *εις απαντησιν* here, based on *בקרב* in 2 Sam 17:11, and translated the expression "zum Kampfe".<sup>70</sup> This suggestion yields a good meaning for the word here, although it makes the phrase somewhat overloaded ("... after Saul into battle after the men of war").

Another difficulty for the Hebrew retroversion of this plus is the translation of the genitive absolute *αυτων παραγενομενων*. Thenius, as we have seen suggested *והנה נאים*,<sup>71</sup> although Driver contested this on the grounds that "*αυτων παραγ.*, if it represents, as it seems to do, *הם נאים*,

---

67 Driver, p. 102.

68 Smith, p. 99, followed by Nowack, Dhorme, Fernandez, Schulz, McCarter, HOTTP.

69 Wellhausen, p. 83.

70 Ewald, *Geschichte* II, p. 477, note 2.

71 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 47.

must be followed by ושאול פקר, not as MT by ויפקד שאול.<sup>72</sup>  
He proposed ויבאו as the original verb here.<sup>73</sup>

The genitive absolute is a fairly rare construction in LXX of Samuel, occurring only ten times. Of these, it represents הַמָּה plus participle in four instances (1 Sam 9:11. 14.27; 17:23); הַמָּה plus a finite verb once (1 Sam 9:5 הַמָּה בָּאוּ [αὐτῶν ἐλθόντων]<sup>74</sup>); וְיִהְיֶה plus infinitive once, at 1 Sam 30:1; וְיִהְיֶה plus הַמָּה at 2 Sam 13:30;<sup>75</sup> וְיִהְיֶה plus participle at 2 Sam 6:16; and an infinitive בָּעֵלְתוּ at 1 Sam 15:3. Thus, nowhere does a genitive absolute represent a simple finite Hebrew verb. Graetz proposed reading הַמָּה בָּאוּ here,<sup>76</sup> but in the only other example of this construction in Sam, at 1 Sam 9:5, the following clause begins ושאול אמר, thus verifying Driver's objection.

Based on the other uses of the genitive absolute in the LXX of Samuel, therefore, one is forced to choose a Hebrew retroversion for αὐτῶν παραγενόμενων which cannot satisfy the requirements of Hebrew grammar.

With a different kind of textual correction in mind for this verse, Ehrlich took the seemingly inverted construction ויפקד שאול to be an indication that the subject of the first half of the verse was originally the same, namely Saul, and was changed to Samuel only after the plus of LXX was introduced into the text.<sup>77</sup> Such a suggestion does solve the two problems in the understanding of the MT but creates another

72 Driver, p. 102. Schulz justified the anomaly here by an appeal to different layers of redaction: "Also werden a und b nicht hintereinander in einem Guss geschrieben sein. Der Redaktor musste die beiden Berichte in Einklang bringen" (p.190).

73 This was accepted by Budde, Smith, Nowack, Dhorme, Kittel, Fernandez and McCarter.

74 But καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦλθον in mss b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>.

75 Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν οὕτως in cod B, but ὡς αὐτοὶ ἦσαν in b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>.

76 Graetz, Geschichte der Juden I, p. 159, note 2.

77 Ehrlich, p. 211.

one, for the explanation of the presence of Samuel as subject, in Ehrlich's interpretation, requires the plus of LXX which he dismisses as unnecessary. That it could have been introduced in the text, occasioned the change of subject in v.15a, and then fallen out again is possible, but unlikely.

An additional problem with the LXX plus is the identification of the two groups of people who are mentioned there, το καταλιμμα του λαου and του λαου του πολεμιστου. The καταλιμμα του λαου may be a reference to those who remained with Saul after some had scattered while waiting for Samuel to arrive at Gilgal (v.11), although the use of this term is somewhat surprising. In v.2, יתר occurs but it is translated in LXX by καταλοιπον. The word καταλ(ε)ιμμα occurs seventeen times in LXX but יתר lies at its base only at Job 22:20.<sup>78</sup> If יתר occurred in the original text here, one would expect καταλοιπον as its translation.

The other group mentioned here, the λαος πολεμιστης, is even more mysterious. From the other uses of the term המלחה עמ or המלחה אנשי, it seems unlikely that this can be a reference to enemy forces, although OL<sup>v</sup> seems to have understood it in this way: in obviam populo quem (qui OL<sup>s</sup>) expugnabant illos (eos OL<sup>s</sup>) venientes ex Galgala in Gabaa in colle Beniamin.<sup>79</sup> The term המלחה עמ is encountered only at Josh 8:1.3; 10:7; 11:7, and never refers to enemy forces. המלחה אנשי occurs twenty-one times<sup>80</sup> of which only one, Jer 49:26, refers to the enemy, and there it is only a passing reference to the troops of Damascus, not a force with which Israel was actively engaged in battle.

78 In the Historical Books, καταλ(ε)ιμμα is used for: נִיר (1 Kgs 15:9); שָׂרִיר (2 Kgs 10:11); שָׂאֲרִית (2 Sam 14:7; 2 Kgs 19:31). In 1 Kgs 12:24, it occurs, as in 1 Sam 13:15, with no Hebrew base.

79 Note that OL contains the fuller reading ex Galgala in Gabaa in colle Beniamin, such as is found in Ant, although the word order follows cod B otherwise.

80 Num 31:28.49; Dt 2:14.16; Josh 5:4.6; 6:3; 10:24; 1 Sam 18:5; 1 Kgs 9:22; 2 Kgs 25:4.19; Jer 38:4; 39:4; 41:3.16; 49:26; 51:32; 52:7.25; Joel 4:9.

Hertzberg identified this group with the force stationed at Geba under Jonathan,<sup>81</sup> but even if this were so, it is difficult to see why the distinction should be made between those who were with Saul and the λαος πολεμιστης, for his forces should have fallen into this category as well. Further, there is no indication, outside of this plus, that the troops remained separated after Jonathan's victory over the Philistine garrison in v.3. In fact, indications to the contrary are found at v.4b, where the people were summoned to join Saul at Gilgal, and in vv.15b and 16, where the same term, חַיִּים נִמְצְאוּ is used to describe those who were with Saul in v.15 and with Saul and Jonathan in v.16.

We must next look at this verse within its context in the over-all narrative. First of all, chapter 13 appears to be a composite, consisting of at least two separate accounts which have been put together. Vv.2-7a and 5b-23 tell of the Israelites' preparations for the battle with the Philistines at Michmash and constitute one story, while vv.7b-15a contain the account of Saul's disobedience in sacrificing at Gilgal and of Samuel's displeasure with him.<sup>82</sup> Further, vv.7b-15 seem to be a later addition to the original narrative.<sup>83</sup> Thus, the interpolation describing Saul's sacrifice and Samuel's denunciation of Saul and his dynasty ends at 13:15a with Samuel departing from Gilgal, while v.15a continues the interrupted story of the battle preparations. If the story-line is followed immediately from v.7a to v.15b, Saul and his troops never left their encampment in the Gibeah region.<sup>84</sup> It is possible that the two accounts were put

81 Hertzberg, p. 107.

82 Cf. Wellhausen, pp. 82 f.

83 Cf. B. Birch, The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Sam 7-15 (Missoula, 1976), p. 75.

84 Wellhausen, Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels<sup>6</sup> (1905), who notes for 1 Sam 13:16 that "hat man wieder den Eindruck, dass Saul mit den Seinen längst in Gibeah gestanden habe, als die Feinde gegenüber Lager schlugen; nur so versteht sich der Gegensatz des zuständigen Particips (sedentes) und der inchoativen Perfekts (castramenti sunt)" (p. 254).



together with the seams still showing, so that Saul and his men suddenly appear in Geba in 13:16. If this is so, then the plus of LXX constitutes an excellent narrative bridge, designed to smooth over a contradiction in the text caused by the insertion of the story of Saul's sacrifice. It is significant that LXX for 1 Sam 15:12 f., which again tells of Saul offering sacrifice against Samuel's wishes, also contains a plus. At 15:12 f., however, a much larger majority of commentators has called its authenticity into question.<sup>85</sup> Both of these pluses, in fact, may be signs of later editorial activity.

As far as Samuel's anomalous departure for Gibeah Benjamin is concerned, it must be noted that when he leaves Gilgal in 13:15, Samuel disappears entirely from the scene until 15:1, where he suddenly appears in order to anoint Saul as king. In the intervening sections, the battle with the Philistines is fought, with the interlude of Jonathan's disobedience and subsequent re-instatement in chapter 14. In 14:46, at the end of the battle, we are told that "Saul went up from pursuing the Philistines," without any specification as to where he went. It does not seem too far-fetched to presume that he went to his home at Gibeah, which would make the scene with Samuel in 15:1 understandable. It is, therefore, possible to consider that the original text of 13:15 did say that Samuel went up to Gibeah Benjamin, even though he is not elsewhere connected with this town.

The main arguments for the acceptance of the LXX plus here are the need for coherence within the narrative and the occasion provided by the repetition of מן-הגלגל for accidental omission through haplography. We have seen, however, the difficulties encountered in finding a suitable Hebrew retroversion for this plus, whereas the Hebrew text of MT is grammatically impeccable. Further, the plus occurs precisely at the point in the narrative which admirably smooths over the transition between two originally separate

---

<sup>85</sup> See below, at 1 Sam 15:12 f.

accounts. An editor who wished to clear up the difficulties here could easily have made his correcting insertion at the precise point at which the problems occurred, the mention of Gilgal, thus creating a text which gave the appearance of providing the occasion for an accident through homeoteleuton. This combination of factors should at least make us hesitant to pronounce too quickly and too categorically in favor of the originality of this plus which has, nevertheless, won the favor of a large majority of commentators on Samuel.

1 Sam 14:41

MT: וַיֹּאמֶר שָׁאוּל לְ-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הֲבָה תַּחֲמִים וַיִּלָּכֵד יוֹנָתָן  
וַיֹּאמֶר וְהָעַם יִצְאוּ

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ειπεν Σαουλ Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ, τι οτι ουκ  
απεκριθης τω δουλω σου σημερον; η εν εμοι η εν  
Ιωναθαν τω υιω μου η αδικια; Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ,  
δος δηλους· και εαν ταδε ειπη, δος δη τω λαω σου  
Ισραηλ, δος δη οσιοτητα. και κληρουται Ιωναθαν και  
Σαουλ, και ο λαος εξηλθεν.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ειπεν Σαουλ Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ, τι οτι ουκ  
απεκριθης τω δουλω σου σημερον; ει εν εμοι η εν  
Ιωναθαν τω υιω μου η αδικια, Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ,  
δος δηλους. και ει ταδε ειποις Εν τω λαω η αδικια,  
δος οσιοτητα. και κατακληρουται Σαουλ και Ιωναθαν,  
και εξηλθεν ο λαος.

The plus present in LXX of 1 Sam 14:41, which extends from *τι οτι ουκ απεκριθης* to *Ισραηλ* 3° in cod B, introduces the Urim and Tummim into the lot-casting process when Saul asks that the Lord indicate the guilty party which impeded the giving of the oracle in v.37. Already Houbigant accepted the originality of the plus, although he blamed the omission in MT on a scribe's eye having skipped from *הבה* [וַיֹּאמֶר] (δος δηλους) to *תחמים* (δος δη οσιοτητα).<sup>86</sup> Thenius, blaming the omission on an accident through homeoteleuton from the first to the third *באשׁוּ*, likewise claimed origi-

<sup>86</sup> Houbigant, p. 308; although this does not explain the omission of the first part of the plus, from *τι οτι* to *Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ*.

nalinity for the LXX text.<sup>87</sup> By far the majority of commentators has subscribed to the accidental omission of this rather lengthy plus and read with LXX.<sup>88</sup> Recent translations have, for the most part, accepted it as well.<sup>89</sup>

Wellhausen argued in favor of the plus on the grounds that חמים by itself in the text would not have been sufficient to evoke the insertion of the Urim and Tummim by the pen of a later editor, and that if הנה חמים is to mean "Gieb Wahrheit = bring sie ans Licht", then the וילכו would occur here with no previous mention of lot-casting, contrary to its ordinary usage.<sup>90</sup> To these, Smith added three other arguments for adopting the LXX text: 1) "the improbability of its being invented by a later author; 2) the difficulty of making sense of the received text; 3) the loss by homeoteleuton is very probable."<sup>91</sup> In addition to these internal reasons, most commentators also point out the value of this plus as being the only passage which gives us any information concerning how the Urim and Tummim actually worked in conveying an oracular decision from the Lord.

Those who oppose the originality of this plus, beginning with Clericus, find that the MT make sufficient sense as it stands.<sup>92</sup> Klostermann maintained that the LXX found the MT form of this account "zu nackt" and therefore introduced the Urim and Tummim in order to fill it out.<sup>93</sup> Ehrlich rejected the plus on the grounds that therein Saul gives Yahweh instructions which are too detailed. Basing his judgment on Dt 13:18 (נָתַן לִי-יְהוָה חֻמִּים), he emends the text

87 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 56.

88 Ewald, Wellhausen, Löhr, Nowack, Peters, Driver, Budde, Smith, Dhorme, Graetz, Hummelauer, McCarter, Kittel, HOTTP, Barthélemy.

89 RSV, NEB, NAB, BJ, Dhorme (1956), Osty. Those who have maintained MT here include Hertzberg, TOB, EÜ and BHS.

90 Wellhausen, p. 94.

91 Smith, p. 122.

92 "Qui sensus cum sat perspicuus esset, mirum est LXX Intt. de suo tot verba infarsisse," Clericus, p. 122.

93 Klostermann, p. 52.

to נחמים, but otherwise accepts MT.<sup>94</sup> There is, however, no justification in the text or in any of the versions for such an emendation.

Fernandez likewise rejected the LXX plus. He discounted as too coincidental the fact that in two successive verses, 41 and 42, such accidental omissions should have taken place.<sup>95</sup> He dismissed as simply unproven Wellhausen's argument that no one, coming upon נחמים in the text, would have thought to read Tummim unless Urim was also present.<sup>96</sup> On the other hand, he finds no difficulty in explaining the addition of such a plus. Since the redactor knew that the context was one of casting lots, when he stumbled on נחמים he read נחמים, which was a known means of consulting the Lord, and since אורים always went with it, he added the Urim along with the rest of the formula.<sup>97</sup>

Keil rejected the plus as "ganz werthlos".<sup>98</sup> While he considered it indisputable that LXX understood נחמים as Tummim, he labeled erroneous the conclusion of Ewald<sup>99</sup> and Thenius that the passage fell out of the text. He reasons that nowhere in the Hebrew OT are נחמים or נחמים (v.42) ever used with the Urim and Tummim, but rather they are technical terms for a simple lot-casting. Secondly, he noted that passages such as 1 Sam 10:22 and 2 Sam 5:23 clearly show that the Urim and Tummim did not give simple "yes" and "no" answers but also added further information as well.<sup>100</sup>

94 Ehrlich, p. 215.

95 In fact, the majority of commentators rejects the authenticity of the plus at v.42. See below.

96 "... pero es ésta una mera afirmación sin prueba alguna, y que por tanto podemos dispensarnos de refutar," Fernandez, p. 89.

97 Fernandez, pp. 88 ff.

98 Keil, p. 107.

99 Ewald, *Geschichte* II, p. 482, note 1: "V.41 lies נחמים für נחמים und ergänze das Uebrige aus den LXX."

100 Keil, p. 107. See also Erdmann, who reproduces Keil's arguments.

Schulz presented six observations which, in his opinion, weaken the argument in favor of the originality of the plus.<sup>101</sup> First, the absence of the article with  $\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  and  $\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\tau\eta\tau\alpha$  in Greek, and  $\text{בְּיָמָהּ}$  in Hebrew, contradicts what one would expect for the Urim and Tummim after the example of Ex 28:30; Lev 8:8; Num 27:21; and 1 Sam 28:6. Second, if Yahweh is solemnly asked to give Urim and/or Tummim, one would expect an expression such as, "Then he gave the Urim lot," or "Then the Urim lot fell out," instead of the words, "Then Saul and Jonathan were taken." This latter phrase is similar to that of 1 Sam 10:20 f., where there is no question of Urim and Tummim in the text. Third, Saul's question to Yahweh in the LXX text seems to be an addition which, moreover, appears to be in the wrong place, since already in v.40 the preparation for the lot-casting has taken place. Fourth, in the text of LXX<sup>B</sup>, only the second sentence is conditional ( $\epsilon\alpha\nu\ \tau\alpha\delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\iota\pi\eta$ ), whereas the first contains an independent disjunctive question, "Is the guilt with me or with my son Jonathan?" On the other hand, if one recognizes an erroneous form in the text of B and accepts that of Ant, it is possible to say that this has been smoothed over in order to avoid the difficulty and to be more in conformity with such passages as 1 Sam 20:7 ff. and 20:21 f. Further,  $\epsilon\iota\ \tau\alpha\delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$  of Ant creates a difficulty, for, on the one hand, commentators since Wellhausen have translated this phrase  $\text{יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ , while on the other, the Greek text definitely indicates that Yahweh should speak here. Fifth, just as Saul's question to Yahweh ( $\tau\iota\ \sigma\tau\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\rho\iota\theta\eta\varsigma\ \tau\omega\ \delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omega\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\nu$ ;) appears to be an addition to the text, the same could be said of the second question ( $\eta\ \epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\mu\omicron\iota\ \eta\ \epsilon\nu\ \text{Ιο-ναθαν} \tau\omega\ \upsilon\omega\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\ \alpha\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha$ ;) . Since the phrase  $\text{Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ}$  occurs both at the beginning and at the end of these two questions, Schulz suggests that it indicates the

---

101 Schulz I, pp. 213-216.

102 A. Toeg, "A Textual Note on 2 Samuel XIV 41," VT 19 (1969), p. 497.

artificial nature of these questions. Sixth, according to Schulz, δηλους as a supposed translation for דָּלוּךְ here is questionable. It appears as such in 1 Sam 28:6 and Num 27:1, but in Dt 33:8 δηλους is the translation for דָּלִי. It can be argued that LXX, for οσιοτητα, read the consonants דָּלִי, but it is possible that where LXX has δηλους, this is meant to represent דָּלִי as well. Further, the δη before οσιοτητα could be the remnant of another δηλους. If this is so, and if one eliminates what Schulz describes as insertions in points three and five, the resulting text reads Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ δος δηλους, just as is found in MT.

A. Toeg has criticized several of these points of Schulz'. With regard to the sixth observation, Toeg notes that Schulz "has been misled by the mechanical system used to coordinate between the Greek and the Hebrew in [Hatch-Redpath] .... It is hard to tell whether this inversed order is to be attributed to the translator or to the Hebrew Vorlage. What remains unquestionable, however, is that we have to do here with a typical case of harmonization."<sup>102</sup> Concerning the repetition of Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ as a sign of insertions in the Greek text, he maintains that "the more extensive version presents a comprehensible whole. Should one indeed break this up into a quite mechanical accumulation of various elements, each necessitating an explanation of its own, the comprehensible whole being merely incidental?"<sup>103</sup>

J. Lindblom, in his article on "Lot-casting in the Old Testament,"<sup>104</sup> also took up the question of the value of this LXX plus. In its favor, he notes, is that "it is materially interesting, and that it gives the impression of originality, "while the Hebrew text is "extremely condensed and for this reason somewhat obscure."<sup>105</sup> On the

---

103 Toeg, "A Textual Note....," p. 496.

104 J. Lindblom, "Lot-casting in the Old Testament," VT 12 (1962) 164-178.

105 Lindblom, "Lot-casting....," p. 176.

other hand, with regard to the alleged meaninglessness of the MT that some authors claim, Lindblom maintains that it is "in its concentration an example of good Hebrew narrative style and does not differ much from many narratives in Genesis against which no objection has been raised."<sup>106</sup> He translates the difficult *הנה נחיה* as "Give a true decision", with the observation that "from the sense 'complete, intact, blameless' there is only a short step to the sense 'correct, true, reliable'."<sup>107</sup> Moreover, as to the objection that in MT the statement that "Jonathan and Saul were taken" is not sufficiently prepared for, he counters that "to every Hebrew reader it was immediately clear that the measures taken in the previous part of the narrative in order to discover who was guilty ... had reference to an ordinary lot-casting procedure."<sup>108</sup>

Lindblom rejects the originality of the LXX text for this verse on what he calls "material grounds". By this he means that the lot-casting procedure described in vv.38-42 was erroneously thought by the LXX translators to have been a cultic one performed by priests, such as is found in vv. 36-37 immediately preceding. The introduction of the Urim and Tummim, which were the apparatus of cultic lot-casting, is the evidence of this error. According to Lindblom, the terminology used in vv.38-42 makes it clear that it was a case of civil lot-casting performed by the laity: "The two parties were placed opposite to each other. Saul and Jonathan were 'taken' and the people 'went out'.... And, above all, it was not a particular individual who performed the lot-casting, it was a group.... The priest had no function at all."<sup>109</sup> He goes on to say that it was the LXX

---

106 Lindblom, "Lot-casting ...," p. 176.

107 Lindblom, "Lot-casting ...," p. 176.

108 Lindblom, "Lot-casting ...," p. 176.

109 Lindblom, "Lot-casting ...," p. 177.

translators who, coming upon the word  $\text{נִחְנֵךְ}$ , conceived of it as  $\text{נִחְנֵךְ}$ , "and as a designation for the priestly oracle. This became the starting point for the creation of the expanded text."<sup>110</sup> The problem according to him, was one of ignorance, for "the naked truth is that the Greek text presents a wholly unhistorical picture of what occurred and that the Greek translators in Egypt had no certain conception of how a priestly oracle with its affirmative or negative answers really worked."<sup>111</sup>

This survey of opinions shows that while the majority of authors accepts the originality of the plus here, this is by no means unanimous. In analysing this LXX plus, we must first establish the Greek text since there are slight but significant differences in the manuscripts.

cod B

Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ  
τι οτι ουκ απεκριθης τω  
δουλω σου σημερον;  
η εν εμοι η εν Ιωναθαν  
τω υιω μου η αδικια;  
Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ  
δος δηλους  
και εαν ταδε ειπη  
δος δη τω λαω σου Ισραηλ  
δος δη οσιοτητα

Ant

Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ  
τι οτι ουκ απεκριθης τω  
δουλω σου σημερον;  
ει εν εμοι η εν Ιωναθαν  
τω υιω μου η αδικια  
Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ  
δος δηλους  
και ει ταδε ειποις  
εν τω λαω η αδικια  
δος οσιοτητα

The Ant text is almost perfectly symmetrical with its two conditional clauses,  $\epsilon\iota$  εν εμοι... corresponding to  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  ει... εν τω λαω...; with  $\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha$  in final position twice; and the parallel  $\delta\omicron\varsigma$  δηλους,  $\delta\omicron\varsigma$  οσιοτητα. The text of cod B, on the other hand, is uneven, fuller, and awkward. It may be argued that in Saul's speech, which is addressed to the Lord in preparation for the lot-casting, one would expect a clear, balanced and well-expressed statement such as is in Ant, but if this is true, the more problematic text of B is hard to account for. The symmetry of Ant would seem to be an indication of its secondary, re-worked status.

<sup>110</sup> Lindblom, "Lot-casting...", p. 177.

<sup>111</sup> Lindblom, "Lot-casting...", p. 177.



As far as B is concerned, Wellhausen has plausibly suggested that  $\delta\varsigma \delta\eta$  1° is a mistaken insertion,<sup>112</sup> but otherwise it is most likely the most primitive form of the Greek text. If we follow B here, along with a certain number of other mss, the picture given of how the oracle is supposed to work is at slight variance from the text of Ant. A number of mss do not contain the second  $\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha$ ,<sup>113</sup> and these same mss lack  $\epsilon\nu$  in the phrase  $\epsilon\nu \tau\omega \lambda\alpha\omega$ .<sup>114</sup> Further, they all contain the phrase  $\delta\varsigma \delta\eta \tau\omega \lambda\alpha\omega \sigma\upsilon$ . The resultant text in these mss reads  $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\alpha\nu \tau\alpha\delta\epsilon \epsilon\iota\pi\eta\varsigma$  ( $\epsilon\iota\pi\eta$  in B)  $\delta\varsigma$  (A om.)  $\delta\eta \tau\omega \lambda\alpha\omega \sigma\upsilon$   $\text{Ισραηλ } \delta\varsigma \delta\eta \sigma\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\tau\eta\tau\alpha$ . They seem, therefore, to indicate, if one reads the Greek simply as it stands, that if Yahweh gives  $\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  to Saul and Jonathan as a sign of guilt, then he is asked to give  $\sigma\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\tau\eta\tau\alpha$  to the people. In this case, the  $\sigma\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\tau\eta\tau\alpha$  (or  $\sigma\iota\gamma\eta$ ) seems to be conceived of as a sign of innocence, not of guilt. The alternative is to reinstate the preposition  $\epsilon\nu$  before  $\tau\omega \lambda\alpha\omega$ .<sup>115</sup> If such is the case, then the  $\sigma\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\tau\eta\tau\alpha$  ( $\sigma\iota\gamma\eta$ ) becomes a sign of the people's guilt. Wellhausen has pointed out that the first  $\delta\varsigma \delta\eta$  is probably a mistaken insertion in the text. While this seems to be a very likely possibility, it does not explain how an original preposition  $\epsilon\nu$  before  $\tau\omega \lambda\alpha\omega$  could have been forced out of the text, and thus, cod B, as the oldest Greek text available, was without the preposition and seems to have understood  $\sigma\iota\gamma\eta$  as a sign of the people's innocence.

The OL text for this verse is partially preserved and this text as well is not entirely uniform. Sabatier's text reads: quid est quod non responderis servo tuo hodie? Si in me, aut in Jonatha filio meo, haec iniquitas est, da ostensionem: aut si ita est in populo tuo haec iniquitas,

112 Wellhausen, p. 94, note.

113 B A c d l p q t y z a<sub>2</sub>. Ms z reads as B, but then adds  $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\iota \tau\alpha\delta\epsilon \epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma \epsilon\nu \tau\omega \lambda\alpha\omega \eta \alpha\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha \delta\varsigma \sigma\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\tau\eta\tau\alpha$  as in Ant.

114 Except for ms y, which contains the  $\epsilon\nu$  here.

115 As found in mss N a b e f h i m n o s v w y b<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>.

da sanctitatem. Vercellone's text reads: Dominus Deus Israel, quid est, quod non responderis servo tuo hodie? Aut si in me aut si in filio meo Jonatha iniquitas est, Domine Deus Israel, da ostensionem: quae est iniquitas in populo tuo Israel dic, da sanctitatem. Sabatier's text is closer to Ant, although  $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\ \omicron\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \text{I}\sigma\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$  is lacking. Aut si ita est for  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$  is, however, problematic. Vercellone's text, while resembling B at aut si in me aut si in filio..., seems closer to Ant with quae est iniquitas in populo tuo Israel dic, although neither text is a literal reproduction of any Greek form. They are both in agreement, however, that ostensionem is a sign of guilt in Saul and Jonathan and sanctitatem is a sign of guilt in the people.

Josephus makes no reference to the Urim and Tummim here and, in fact, does not seem to show any particular interest in the lot-casting process since he has simply: "... he forthwith caused them [the people] all to stand in one place, and stood himself with his son in another, and sought by the lot ( $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\omega$ ) to discover the sinner; and the lot indicated Jonathan."<sup>116</sup>

The expression  $\text{וְהָיָה בְּיָדְךָ}$  has been criticized as incorrect,<sup>117</sup> although, as we saw, defended by Lindblom as constituting perfectly good Hebrew narrative. The verb  $\text{וְהָיָה}$ , outside of the occasions where it serves as a kind of interjection ("Come now..." in Gen 11:3.4.7; 38:16; Ex 1:10), means "to give", but does not appear in a lot-casting or oracular context outside of 14:41. It ordinarily takes a concrete direct object (e.g., Gen 29:21, when Jacob says to Laban, "Give me my wife."), but can also have the meaning "to ascribe", as in Ps 29:1: "Ascribe to the Lord glory and strength."<sup>118</sup> E. Noort has pointed out the use of  $\text{וְהָיָה}$

<sup>116</sup> Ant. VI, 125.

<sup>117</sup> E. g. Toeg, who notes, "This vocalization seems to be a desperate attempt to make the best of a corrupt text" ("A Textual Note...", p. 497).

<sup>118</sup> Cf. also Pss 29:2; 96:7.8; 1 Chr 16:28 f.; Dt 32:3.

in the Qumran Testimonia in a text which cites Dt 33:8: <sup>119</sup> וּלְלוֹי אָמַר הָבָה לְלוֹי תַּמִּיךְ וְאוֹרֹךְ לְאִישׁ חֲסִידֶךָ. Although הָבָה appears here with the Urim and Tummim, it is not used in the sense of giving an oracle or a response, but in the simple handing over of the material objects. Nonetheless, of course, the fact that this verb is used with them here cannot be discounted. Noort concludes that הָבָה תַּמִּיךְ should be read at 1 Sam 14:41, but at the same time rightly points out that "the Qumran parallel in itself naturally says nothing about the plus of LXX over against MT at 1 Sam 14:41."<sup>120</sup>

תַּמִּיךְ, outside of its use as describing the purity of animals for sacrifice,<sup>121</sup> usually means "complete", "sound", "innocent", and many commentators have insisted on its lack of suitability in the context of 14:41.<sup>122</sup> A good number, however, claim that it fits well here, although their proposals for its meaning are varied.<sup>123</sup> Klostermann, on the other hand, while rejecting the LXX plus, nevertheless read תַּמִּיךְ here and translated: "Offenbare (die Schuld und) die Unschuld."<sup>124</sup>

While תַּמִּיךְ is basically used adjectivally, it may be used as a substantive as well. BDB<sup>125</sup> gives as one of its meanings, "What is complete, entirely in accord with truth and fact" (cf. Am 5:10; Judg 9:16.19; Josh 24:14; Pss 18:26 (= 2 Sam 22:26); 84:12). LXX has translated תַּמִּיךְ with no less than twenty-six different adjectives or nouns, although in cod B, 1 Sam 14:41 is the only time it appears as οὐλομένης.

119 E. Noort, "Eine weitere Kurzbemerkung zu 1 Samuel XIV 41," VI 21 (1971), p. 114.

120 Noort, "Eine weitere Kurzbemerkung...", p. 116.

121 Lev passim; Ex 12:5; Num 6:14; Ezek 43:22.23; 45:18; 46:4.

122 E. g. Driver, p. 117.

123 Keil: "Gib Unsträflichkeit"; Erdmann: "Schaffe Recht"; Schulz: "Lass die Wahrheit an den Tag kommen"; Stoebe: "Gib vollkommene Klarheit"; Lindblom: "Give a true decision"; Hertzberg: "Give a right judgment".

124 Klostermann, p. 52.

125 BDB, sub תַּמִּיךְ.

But in seven occurrences of  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  we find the following variants from cod B:<sup>126</sup>

Josh 24:14  $\text{עַל עֲשׂוֹתָיו]$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  g n w  
 Judg 9:16  $\text{תְּלֵמִיתָיו]$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  g l n o w  
           9:16  $\text{תְּלֵמִיתָיו]$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  g l n o w  
 2 Sam 22:24  $\text{אֲמָמוֹס]$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>  
           22:26  $\text{תְּלֵמִיתָיו]$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>  
           22:31  $\text{אֲמָמוֹס]$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>  
           22:33  $\text{אֲמָמוֹס]$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>

The picture that emerges from these variants is that mss g (l) n (o) w in Josh-Judg and b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> in 2 Sam have a preference for the  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$ - for  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$ . In cod B,  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  for  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  appears only at Prv 2:21; Am 5:10; Sir 39:24. For the passages cited above from 2 Sam, mss b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> represent the OG, as do g l n o w in Josh-Judg.

In the other passages in which the Urim and Tummim appear,  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  is never used for these terms:

Ex 28:30  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ-וְיָמֵהּ]$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   
 Lev 8:8 " " ]  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   
 Num 27:21  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ וְיָמֵהּ]$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   
 Dt 33:8  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ וְיָמֵהּ]$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   
 1 Sam 28:6  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ]$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   
 Ezr 2:63  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ וְיָמֵהּ]$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   
 Neh 7:65  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ וְיָמֵהּ]$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$   
 Isa 24:15  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ]$  -----

Since  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  never occurs in Sam we may not draw any absolute conclusions as to how it would have been rendered by the LXX translators, but if we take the information we have at hand, it seems evident that at 14:41 they were aware of the vocalization  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  since they rendered it as  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$ .

126 Outside of the passages cited,  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$  appears, in Josh-Judg-Sam, elsewhere only at Josh 10:13, where the context understandably does not suggest  $\text{וְיָמֵהּ}$ .

The expression הנה תמים occurs nowhere else in the Bible. We do have, however, one instance of נָתַן תָּמִים, at Ps 18:33 (וַיִּתֵּן תָּמִים דְּרָכִי), although parallel in 2 Sam 22:33 reads וַיִּתֵּן וַיִּתֵּן for וַיִּתֵּן. LXX translates Ps 18:33 as καὶ ἐθετο ἀμωμον την οδον μου, while for 2 Sam 22:33 we find καὶ ἐξετιναξεν ἀμωμον την οδον μου in cod B, but b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> (OG) read διδους οσλοτητα ταις οδοις. Thus, the notion of "giving tamim" is not entirely absent from the Bible.

One of the major difficulties in deciding upon the authenticity of the LXX plus at 1 Sam 14:41 is the scarcity of information given in the Bible concerning the lot-casting process in general, and the functioning of the Urim and Tummim in particular. An examination of the decisions referred to the Lord in Josh-Judg-Sam reveals that the Urim and Tummim as such are never mentioned. In simple inquiries, the formula is שאל ביהוה.<sup>127</sup> Of the eleven instances of this form of inquiry, the actual presence of the ephod is mentioned only at 1 Sam 23:11 f. and 30: 7 f. An apparently more complicated process, by which gradual elimination reveals one individual who is either guilty of something or who is specially chosen by God, is described in Josh 7:14-18 to designate Achan as the transgressor of the covenant, and in 1 Sam 10:20 ff. to select Saul as God's chosen king. The process in each case consists of the formula וילכד...ויקרב. In neither case, however, are the Urim and Tummim or the ephod specifically mentioned.

The process described in 1 Sam 14:41 f. most closely resembles this gradual elimination process. וילכד determines the guilty party, while, although ויקרב is not used here, the picture presented of Saul gathering all the people together for the lot-casting, and placing them on one side with himself and Jonathan on the other, seems to replace this verb. The lack of uniformity in the different

<sup>127</sup> Judg 1:1; 1 Sam 14:37; 22:10.13; 23:2.4; 30:7 f.; 2 Sam 2:1; 5:19.23. 1 Sam 23:11 f. seems to portray the same kind of simple inquiry, although the formula שאל ביהוה is not used.

descriptions of this process is further shown by the fact that the solemn invocation of the Lord (which is more in evidence in LXX than in MT here), is found only at 14:41 and 1 Sam 23:11.

If the ephod or the Urim and Tummim are conceived of as being used for each of these oracles, it is again difficult to see exactly how they operated.<sup>128</sup> In addition to the lack of knowledge surrounding the instruments themselves, we do not know how the message of the oracle was communicated. For the oracles in the simple form (שאל יהוה), the response is not merely a "yes" or "no", "true" or "false" answer, but often contains more than what was in the request. For example, at 1 Sam 23:2, when David inquires, "'Shall I go and attack these Philistines?'" the Lord's response is, "'Go and attack the Philistines and save Keilah.'"

In the two instances outside of 1 Sam 14:41 where the process of gradual elimination is employed, some indication of choice obviously must have been given, although it has not been preserved for us in the texts. This fact, coupled with the absence of any mention of lot-casting instrument or even, in most cases, of an invocation to the Lord, may be an indication that at the time of the writing of these books, there was a lack of knowledge, or a lack of interest, about the lot-casting process itself. As far as the three instances of gradual elimination are concerned, they are each situated within a larger context where the main point of the story is other than the simple designation of the person involved, which may explain this lack of attention to detail as well. For 1 Sam 14:41, this may be an indication that the Urim and Tummim are not absolutely necessary for the story. In fact, if the attention to detail found in the LXX plus here is compared with the apparent

---

128 Cf. E. Robertson, "The Urim and Tummim: What Were They?" VT 14 (1964), p. 68, who observes that "... no hint is given as to what the Urim and Tummim are, nor in what way they are used."

lack of concern for such details in the other lot-casting or oracle accounts, the LXX form of this text may be seen as strangely out of place.

A further indication of the confusion surrounding these lot and oracle texts is the high incidence of divergence between MT and LXX. In Josh 7:17 f., 1 Sam 10:21, 14:41, 23:11 f., and 30:7 the two texts are in disagreement, as the underlined portions indicate:

Josh 7:17 f.: ויקרב את-משפחת יהודה וילכד את משפחת הזרחי<sup>17</sup>  
ויקרב את-משפחת הזרחי לגברים וילכד זבדי<sup>18</sup> ויקרב את-ביתו לגברים  
 וילכד עכן בן-כרמי בן-זבדי בן-זרח למטה יהודה  
 LXX: <sup>17</sup>και προσηχθη κατα δημοις, και ενεδειχθη δημοις ο Ζαραι·  
 και προσηχθη κατα ανδρα, <sup>18</sup>και ενεδειχθη Αχαρ υιος Ζαμβοι  
 υιου Ζαρα.

1 Sam 10:21: ויקרב את-שבט בנימן למשפחתו ותלכד משפחת המטרי  
וילכד שאול בן-קיש ויבקשו ולא נמצא  
 LXX<sup>B</sup>: και προσαγει σκηπτρον Βενιαμειν εις φυλας, και κατα-  
 κληρουται φυλη Ματταρει· και προσαγουσιν την φυλην Ματταρει  
εις ανδρας, και κατακληρουται Σαουλ υιος Κεις, και εξητει  
αυτον, και ουχ ευρισκατο.  
 1 Sam 23:11 f.: היסגרני בעלי קעילה בידו הירד שאול כאשר שמע<sup>11</sup>  
עבדך יהוה אלהי ישראל הגד-נא לעבדך ויאמר יהוה ירד<sup>12</sup> ויהאמר דוד  
היסגרנו בעלי קעילה אחי ואח-אבשי ביד-שאול ויאמר יהוה יסגירו  
 LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>11</sup>ει αποκλεισθησεται; και νυν ει καταβησεται Σαουλ  
 καθως ηκουσεν ο δουλος σου; Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ, απαγγειλον  
 τω δουλω σου. <sup>12</sup>και ειπεν Κυριος Αποκλεισθησεται.  
 1 Sam 30:7: ויהאמר דוד אל-אביתו הכהן בן-אחימלך הגישה-נא לי  
האפד ויגש אביתר את-האפד אל-דוד  
 LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ειπεν Δαυειδ προς Αβιαθαρ τον ιερεα υιον Αχειμελεχ  
 προσαγαγε το εφουδ.

Is it merely a coincidence that so many of these texts having to do with lots or oracles have been altered or have suffered textual accidents? With such an accumulation of texts, it seems more plausible to conclude that editorial activity has taken place in texts which described an institution that was no longer in use at a later moment in Israel's history.

In later Jewish literature, the Urim and Tummim seem to have taken on a greater importance than in the Bible itself. Both the Babylonian and the Jerusalem Talmuds give an etymological explanation for the Urim and Tummim, although they are not exactly the same in both places. In the Babylonian Talmud we read, "Why were they called Urim and Tummim? Urim because they made their words enlightening. Tummim because they fulfill their words."<sup>129</sup> And in the Jerusalem Talmud it is explained, "Urim because it illuminated Israel, and Tummim because it smoothed out the way before the Israelites on the road, when they were innocent."<sup>130</sup>

In the treatise Soṭah in the Babylonian Talmud, it is mentioned that "when the Former Prophets died the Urim and Thummim ceased,"<sup>131</sup> and in Shebu'oth, "For additions are not made to the city [of Jerusalem], or to the temple compartments except by king, prophet, Urim and Tummim."<sup>132</sup>

When David inquires into the cause of the plague (2 Sam 21) and MT reads, "And David sought the face of the Lord," the treatise Yebamoth relates that, "Resh Lakish explained, 'He enquired of the Urim and Tummim. How is this inferred? R. Eleazar replied: It is arrived at by an analogy between the two occurrences of the expression of "countenance of", for here it is written, 'And David sought the countenance of the Lord,' and elsewhere it is written, 'who shall enquire for him by the judgment of the Urim before the countenance of the Lord' [Num 27:21]."<sup>133</sup>

129 Yoma 73b (trans. L. Jung) in The Babylonian Talmud. Mo'ed III, edited by I. Epstein (London, 1938), p. 351.

130 Yoma VII in Le Talmud de Jérusalem, t. 5, M. Schwab ed. (Paris, 1882), p. 246.

131 Soṭah 48a (trans. A. Cohen) in The Babylonian Talmud. Nashim III, edited by I. Epstein (London, 1936), p. 256.

132 Shebu'oth 14a (trans. A. E. Silverstone) in The Babylonian Talmud. Nezikim IV, edited by I. Epstein (London, 1935), p. 67.

133 Yebamoth 78b (trans. I. W. Slotki) in The Babylonian Talmud. Nashim I, edited by I. Epstein (London, 1936), p. 534. The same explanation is given in the Mishnah Rabbah for Numbers VIII,.



All of these references show an increased interest in the Urim and Tummim, as well as a tendency to refer to them in contexts where they are not specifically mentioned in the Bible. Especially significant is the final passage cited, from Yebamoth, which links the Urim and Tummim to David's inquiry through one word, לָנָנִי. It is not impossible that מַחֲמִים in 1 Sam 14:41 could have engendered the same process.

Looking now at the form of Saul's invocation to the Lord, we note that the LXX lacks אֱל, making "Lord God of Israel" a part of Saul's speech. Most commentators have accepted the LXX reading here, and Toeg finds the repetition of this formula to be "one of the most remarkable evidences to the authenticity of G."<sup>134</sup> Toeg's point that "יהוה אלהי ישראל constitutes a formula used frequently in addressing the deity, and almost exclusively in direct speech"<sup>135</sup> is well taken, although the elimination of אֱל as a dittography (...ל.ויאמר שאול אֱל. in MT)<sup>136</sup> may be accepted independently of any considerations about the authenticity of LXX as far as the plus is concerned. His plea in favor of the acceptance of the plus based on the repetition of the formula is less cogent, however. He maintains that "it can be proved to be in conformity with a conventional liturgical formula in Israelite divination,"<sup>137</sup> although for all the texts which refer to lot-casting or oracles, 1 Sam 23:10 f. alone contains the formula. Its presence there may be used either as the verification of its authenticity in 14:41, or as an indication that a later editor conceived of the idea of inserting it in 14:41 because of its use in 23:10, and thus,

<sup>134</sup> Toeg, "A Textual Note...", p. 497.

<sup>135</sup> Toeg, "A Textual Note...", p. 497.

<sup>136</sup> This was already suggested by Thenius, followed by Budde, Klostermann, Smith, Nowack, Dhorme. Schulz and Stoebe take יהוה as the object of אֱל, and then make יהוה אֱל part of the direct address, but the breaking up of this formula seems less likely.

<sup>137</sup> Toeg, "A Textual Note...", p. 497.

does not constitute a proof one way or the other.

The final observation which must be made concerning this plus here is the presence, in v.42, of another LXX plus of approximately the same length and manifesting the same possibility of having fallen out of MT because of homeoteleuton. Thenius accepted it as authentic, but many commentators have followed Wellhausen in rejecting its authenticity (see below for a fuller discussion of 14:42). It would indeed be remarkable that in two consecutive verses exactly the same type of error should have occurred. Further, it would seem to be necessary to imagine that if a copyist's error had taken place for one or both of these verses, it must have occurred in a manuscript which was subsequently neither re-read for correction nor used publicly in any way. The absence of the Urim and Tummim, if they were original in the text, would surely have been noticed by anyone familiar with the text.

There is, in reality, nothing in any one of the preceding observations which forces us to conclude that the LXX plus was not original. On the other hand, however, the accumulation of these observations should at least leave open the possibility that the LXX translators worked from a text which contained simply הנה חמים, as witnessed by their translation οὐλοῦντα, and took advantage of the similarity between this word and חמים in order to make their addition which would have filled out the narrative and introduced the Urim and Tummim here. If such was the case, then they would have taken the word ישראל as their point of departure and concluded the insertion on the same word. This case, however, is highly uncertain and it does not seem possible to arrive at a definite decision either in favor of MT or of LXX here.

# 1 Sam 14:42

MT: ויאמר שאול הפילו ביני ובין יונתן בני וילכד יונתן

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ειπεν Σαουλ Βαλετε ανα μεσον εμου και ανα μεσον Ιωναθαν του υιου μου· ον αν κατακληρωσεται Κυριος, αποθανετω. και ειπεν ο λαος προς Σαουλ Ουκ εστιν το ρημα τουτο. και κατεκρατησεν Σαουλ του λαου, και βαλλουσιν ανα μεσον αυτου και ανα μεσον Ιωναθαν του υιου αυτου, και κατακληρουται Ιωναθαν.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ειπεν Σαουλ Βαλετε κληρον ανα μεσον εμου και ανα μεσον Ιωναθαν του υιου μου, και ον εαν κατακληρωσεται Κυριος, αποθανετω. και ειπεν ο λαος προς Σαουλ Ουκ εσται κατα το ρημα τουτο. και κατεκρατησεν Σαουλ του λαου, και βαλλουσιν κληρους ανα μεσον αυτου και ανα μεσον Ιωναθαν, και κατακληρουται Ιωναθαν.

Immediately following the plus of 14:41, we find another long plus in LXX 14:42 which recounts both the people's opposition to Saul's decision to cast the lot between himself and Jonathan, and the lot-casting itself. Thenius<sup>138</sup> attributed the loss of the plus to homeoteleuton occasioned by the similarity between וַיַּב and וַיִּב. Klostermann added the observation that MT is too short as it stands and thus requires the material found in LXX,<sup>139</sup> while Budde noted that "the sentence is necessary to give perfect point to Saul's utterance in v.39."<sup>140</sup> The plus is attested to in all Greek mss, although ον... τουτο is marked with ÷ in ms c<sub>2</sub> and ον... αυτου with X in ms m. The same ms m carries the marginal note that the plus is found in Theodotion's text as well.

Wellhausen rejected the authenticity of the plus on the grounds that even though the people do eventually show their opposition, in v.45, it would have been irreverent for them to interrupt the lot-casting process with their objection, and further, the uncertainty of the determination of guilt between the two would have been so intolerable for the people that they would not have interrupted the process. As a result of its interrupting this process, the plus in v.42, when compared with the people's demand in v.45 that

138 He was followed by Klostermann, Smith, Budde, Dhorme, Peters and McCarter.

139 Klostermann, p. 53.

140 Budde (SBOT), p. 64.

Jonathan be exonerated, gives evidence, according to Wellhausen, of coming from a "Geist einer späteren Zeit."<sup>141</sup>

Schulz noted further that the addition really adds nothing new to what is said in v.39, which is itself a preparation for the opposition of the people in v.45.<sup>142</sup> Driver, who took no note of the plus in his first edition, observed in the second that "although its omission could be readily explained by homeoteleuton, its originality is doubtful."<sup>143</sup>

The material possibility of an accident through homeoteleuton is definitely present here, as the last five words of the plus would have been almost exactly the same as MT:<sup>144</sup>

MT: מפילו ביני ובין יונתן בני

LXX: ויפילו בינו ונין יונתן בנו

Since this is so, it is all the more surprising that so many commentators and all the recent translations have followed Wellhausen in rejecting its authenticity. Budde, followed by Smith and Dhorme, specifically opposed Wellhausen's reasoning here, saying that "the people's dread of losing in either case one of their leaders overbears all other considerations."<sup>145</sup> Unfortunately, Wellhausen neither developed any further his notion of the "Geist einer späteren Zeit", nor did he give any further explanation of how he arrived at this conclusion. In the decision for or against the authenticity of this plus, we are confronted simply with different estimations of what would or would not have been right for the people to say on such an occasion.<sup>146</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> Wellhausen, p. 95, followed by Nowack, Ehrlich, Kittel, Schulz, Fernandez, Stoebe, Hertzberg, RSV, NEB, NAB, BJ, Gsty, TOB, Eü.

<sup>142</sup> Schulz, p. 217.

<sup>143</sup> Driver, p. 118.

<sup>144</sup> This could especially be so, as McCarter points out (p. 248), since the difference between yod and waw was frequently very slight.

<sup>145</sup> Budde (SBOT), p. 64.

<sup>146</sup> This case may be an example of what Löhr feared when he warned against the danger of the subjectivity too often

An examination of the textual witnesses is of no greater help in judging the plus. Smith pointed out the importance of the fact that it is contained in the codd A and B as well as in the "Lucianic" text, plus being one of the few cases which is marked with an asterisk of Origen.<sup>147</sup> This, however, is simply a confirmation that the text truly formed a part of the original OG, but it may not be used mechanically to determine its true authenticity.

Klostermann and Smith<sup>148</sup> have both argued that the MT form of v.42 is too abrupt to have been original. It may be, however, that it is merely terse and dramatic, while the longer LXX form seems to dissipate the focus of attention, thus making the decision less poignant. The ἀποθάνετω in the plus, moreover, seems repetitive and unnecessary in the light of v.39 where Saul declares that the guilty party "shall surely die." The people's complaint that οὐκ ἐστὶν το πῦρ τοῦτο seems further to dissipate the effect of v.45 where, once Jonathan has been singled out as the guilty one, the people rise in opposition against Saul's condemnation of Jonathan to death. While MT seems truncated in omitting to say that the lots were actually cast and LXX specifies that καὶ βαλλοῦσιν κτλ., the shorter text does not really pose a problem. Such texts as 1 Sam 9:3 f. and 13:9 show that, once an order is given, the action of its being carried out is not necessarily expressed.

The text of Ant here seems to indicate further editorial activity beyond the original Greek text:

---

used in deciding on the reading for a text (cf. Introduction, p. 3). Löhr himself here noted the opposed positions without taking a stand (p. 64).

<sup>147</sup> Smith, p. 124.

<sup>148</sup> Klostermann, p. 53; Smith, p. 122.

<u>B</u>	<u>Ant</u>
βαλετε]	+ κληρον
ον αν]	και ον εαν
το ρημα]	κατα το ρημα
βαλλουσιν]	+ κληρους
του υιου	
αυτου]	omit

In MT, הפילו to indicate the casting of lots occurs without לוגיו only here and at Job 6:27.<sup>149</sup> In the latter case, the lot-casting is not within a context of a decision-making so 14:42 may be considered to stand alone. OG translated literally while Ant apparently wanted to bring the text into conformity with the standard formula, βαλλειν κληρον/ους, found in the other texts with לוגיו הפיל.

The expression which the people use when they complain to Saul, ουκ εστιν το ρημα τουτο, is found nowhere else, nor does זהו הדבר יהיה (אז) occur in MT. Ant's variant εσται for εστιν,<sup>150</sup> appears to be an attempt to improve on the grammar of the Greek expression. Thenius explained εστιν as either a mistake for εσται or as a corruption in the Hebrew text where the initial yod of יהיה would have been accidentally blotted out.<sup>151</sup> No one else comments on the difficulty of giving a good Hebrew retroversion here. This may point, however, to the fact that what looks like a translation from Hebrew may be LXX's own Hebraism.

Considering, therefore, both the apparent superfluousness of the material contained in the plus, as well as the difficulty in providing a satisfying Hebrew retroversion, we can consider this plus not to have been original in the text. The reader already knows that Jonathan is the guilty one, and is already prepared for his being indicated as such by v.39 when Saul says, "Though it be in Jonathan my son, he shall surely die." The LXX translators may have been

149 Contrast 1 Chr 25:8; 26:13 f.; Neh 10:35; 11:1; Est 3:7; 9:24; Ps 22:19; Prv 1:14; Jon 1:7 (bis), where לגר is present.

150 Which it shares with mss d e f l m p q s t w z. OL<sup>v</sup> here reads non est hoc verbum, in accordance with cod B.

151 Thenius<sup>2</sup>, p. 65.

disconcerted that the older text did not actually say that the lots were cast, and, desiring to add this detail as well as spell out the people's opposition to Saul's action, inserted the plus whose ending reproduced the last five words of the text to which it was added, thus creating a situation in the Greek text which, when compared with MT's terser presentation of the scene, gave the appearance that the shorter text had fallen victim to a textual accident.

1 Sam 15:12 f.

MT: וישכם שמואל לקראת שאול בבקר ויגד לשמואל לאמר בא-שאול הכרמלה  
והנה מציב לו יד ויסב ויעבר וירד הגלגל<sup>13</sup> ויבא שמואל  
אל-שאול ויאמר לו שאול ברוך אתה ליהוה הקימתי את-דבר יהוה

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>12</sup> και ωρθρισεν Σαμουηλ και επορευθη εις απαντησιν  
Ισραηλ πρωι· και απηγγελη τω Σαουλ λεγοντες Ηκει  
Σαμουελ εις Καρμηλον, και ανεστακεν αυτω χειρα.  
και επεστρεφεν το αρμα και κατεβη εις Γαλγαλα προς  
Σαουλ, και ιδου αυτος ανεφερεν ολοκαυτωσιν τω Κυριω,  
τα πρωτα των σκυλων ων ηνεγκεν εξ Αμαληκ. <sup>13</sup> και  
παρεγενετο Σαμουηλ προς Σαουλ, και ειπεν αυτω Σαουλ  
Ευλογητος συ τω Κυριω. εστησα οσα ελαλησεν Κυριος.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: <sup>12</sup> και ωρθρισεν Σαμουηλ και επορευθη εις απαντησιν  
τω Ισραηλ πρωι. και απηγγελη τω Σαμουηλ λεγοντων  
Ηκει Σαουλ εις τον Καρμηλον και ιδου ανεστακεν  
εαυτω χειρα. και απεστρεφεν το αρμα αυτου, και κατεβη  
εις Γαλγαλα. και ηλθεν Σαμουηλ προς Σαουλ και ιδου  
αυτος ανεφερεν ολοκαυτωμα τω Κυριω, τας απασχας των  
σκυλων ων ηνεγκεν εξ Αμαληκ και παρεγενετο Σαμουηλ  
προς Σαουλ, και ειπεν αυτω Σαουλ Ευλογημενος συ τω  
Κυριω· εστησα απαντα οσα ελαλησεν Κυριος.

In this scene which describes the encounter between Samuel and Saul after the latter had disobeyed the Lord's order to destroy the Amalekites completely, LXX<sup>B</sup> is characterized by a partial change in the rôles attributed to Samuel and Saul, a few minor modifications of the text in v.12 (+ και επορευθη; εις απαντησιν Ισραηλ for ויבא לקראת; και ανεστακεν for ויהנה מציב) and a substantial plus which tells of Saul's sacrificing the animals taken as booty from the Amalekites. Ant has attempted to reconcile MT and LXX: while it maintained και επορευθη and εις απαντησιν Ισραηλ and the plus, it has re-established the rôles of Samuel and

Saul according to MT, added  $\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon$  for  $\eta\eta\eta$  in v.12, and  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$   $\Sigma\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\eta\lambda$  before  $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$   $\Sigma\alpha\upsilon\lambda$  at the beginning of v.13.<sup>152</sup>

Thenius<sup>153</sup> accepted the originality of the plus, attributing its loss to an accident occasioned by the repetition of  $\lambda\omicron\iota\psi\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\alpha$  both before and after it. It must be pointed out, however, that this repetition occurs only in Ant<sup>154</sup> and there is no reason here for preferring Ant to cod B as a faithful witness of the genuine OG.

Erdmann rejected the plus on the grounds that LXX inserted the mention of the sacrifice here by analogy with Saul's sacrifice in 1 Sam 13:8-15.<sup>155</sup> Wellhausen suggested that in addition to 13:8-15, 15:21 had also influenced the addition, and noted further that it is only in v.14 that Samuel hears the bleating of the sheep and the oxen and there is no question there of sacrifices.<sup>156</sup> The majority of commentators has followed Wellhausen in rejecting the plus.<sup>157</sup>

Whether 15:1-34 represents a second telling of the same sacrifice as that of 13:7b-15a,<sup>158</sup> or whether the two incidents "describe different moments in the progressive denunciation of Saul,"<sup>159</sup> the fact of their similarity seems to have led LXX (or already its Vorlage<sup>160</sup>) to add a clause here at 15:12 f. in order to make this similarity more

152 Likewise OL, here represented by the Quedlinburg fragments (edited by Weissbrodt [Braunsberg, 1887]).

153 Along with Ewald, Graetz, Budde, Peters, Dhorme, McCarter.

154 The phrase  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$   $\Sigma\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\eta\lambda$  is found in mss N e f g h<sup>b</sup> j m n s w b<sub>2</sub>.

155 Erdmann, p. 195.

156 Wellhausen, p. 99.

157 Klostermann, Nowack, Driver, Smith, Hummelauer, Fernandez, Ehrlich, Schulz, Kittel, Hertzberg, Stoebe, Barthélemy.

158 Wellhausen, Prolegomena, pp. 258-260.

159 McCarter, p. 271, note 4, in agreement with Birch, The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy, pp. 105-108.

160 Klostermann, while rejecting the originality of the plus, nevertheless suggested that it went back to a Hebrew text (p. 58). Cf. also Stoebe, p. 290.



explicit. LXX seems either to have confused the rôles of Samuel and Saul, or else deliberately to have reversed them. In MT it is Saul who went to Carmel to set up a monument, while LXX attributes this action to Samuel. The fact that LXX says that Samuel rose in the morning to meet "Israel" is perhaps an indication that it simply misread לְקִרְאָה שָׂאֻל.

Wellhausen maintained that και παρεγενετο Σαμουηλ προς Σαουλ, after the LXX plus, does not belong to the authentic LXX.<sup>161</sup> This would mean, however, that LXX did not read לְקִרְאָה שָׂאֻל שְׁמוֹאֵל וַיָּבֹא, or else truncated it to προς Σαουλ. Such an explanation seems unnecessary, however, for, as the text of OG (cod B) stands, the προς Σαουλ at the beginning of v.13 is necessary to indicate that, in its version, Samuel is the subject of all the preceding verbs and that Saul is the subject of ανεφερεν. It is less probable that it is the remnant of a translation of לְקִרְאָה-לְאֵל of v.13 than that it is an addition. Και παρεγενετο Σαμουηλ προς Σαουλ is the translation of this phrase after the LXX insertion. An indication of this is not only that the text of Ant contains the clause twice, in an effort to maintain the Greek text while accommodating it to MT, but also that Ant preserves the OG και παρεγενετο in its place, while in its own text it translates וַיָּבֹא as και ηλθεν. Thus the phrase προς Σαουλ of LXX v.12, which cannot be a translation of לְקִרְאָה-לְאֵל in v.13, serves as the hinge between the end of v.12 and the LXX insertion. It is integral to the insertion for without it αυτος ανεφερεν would not have an antecedent. It was, therefore, around Saul's name that the plus was inserted into the text, the result being that we have, in OG, a text whose structure appears to be "haplogenic". Ant, which mistook the προς Σαουλ of v.12 for a vestige of לְקִרְאָה שָׂאֻל שְׁמוֹאֵל וַיָּבֹא, read both και ηλθεν Σαμουηλ προς Σαουλ in v.12 and OG's και παρεγενετο Σαμουηλ προς Σαουλ in v.13, thus completing the haplogenic form of the text and establishing a text which led Thenius and others to make a correction where, in fact, the

---

<sup>161</sup> Wellhausen, p. 99.

"homeoteleuton" was the product of Ant's misunderstanding of OG's insertion.

1 Sam 23:6

MT: ויהי בברח אביתר בן-אחימלך אל-דוד קעילה אפוד ירד בידו

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και εγενετο εν τω φυγειν Αβιαθαρ υιον Αβειμελεχ προς Δαυειδ, και αυτος μετα Δαυειδ εις Κεσιλα κατεβη, εχων εφουδ εν τη χειρι αυτου.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και εγενετο εν τω φευγειν Αβιαθαρ τον υιον Αχιμελεχ προς Δαυειδ εις Κεσιλα, κατεβη εχων εφουδ εν τη χειρι αυτου.

Most commentators have found this verse puzzling both because Abiathar's flight after David has already been described in 22:20 and because of the difficulty in making any sense out of the grammar of v.6b אפוד ירד בידו. LXX here contains a small plus, και αυτος μετα Δαυειδ, in all mss except Ant, as well as a slightly different word order in v.6b. Thenius considered the plus to be original, having fallen out of the text accidentally through homeoteleuton at דוד.<sup>162</sup> As Driver pointed out, however, this does not relieve the verse of difficulty,<sup>163</sup> and even those who reject LXX's originality here suggest some rearrangement of v.6b,<sup>164</sup> based either on LXX or on an inversion of word order to yield אפוד ירד (Wellhausen), or ירד קעילה האפוד (Nowack, Ehrlich). Klostermann proposed מעיל האפוד בידו,<sup>165</sup> but as Dhorme pointed out, the expression "to have the robe of the ephod in one's hand is attested nowhere."<sup>166</sup> Kittel read והאפוד הוריד, following Tg ויהי אפודה אחיט בידיה, but if this were so, the cause of the corruption is not clear.

162 Followed by Budde, Peters, Dhorme (1910), Schulz, Hertzberg, McCarter, NAB.

163 Driver, p. 184, note 1, showed that אפוד ירד cannot be the resumption of a clause introduced by ויהי.

164 Wellhausen, Erdmann, Klostermann, Hummelauer, Nowack, Driver, Smith, Kittel, Stoebe, RSV, NEB, Dhorme (1956), Osty, BJ, TOB, Eü.

165 Klostermann, p. 101.

166 Dhorme, p. 208.

Even if the longer LXX is accepted as original, there is no explanation which readily suggests itself in order to show how the shorter and problematic MT could have arisen. It is manifestly disturbed, and the LXX form, which provides a good, clear meaning to what MT seems to attempt to say, is precisely what one would expect in order to make sense out of a difficult and possibly mutilated text. This suggests that an early corruption had already taken place before LXX.

As far as the plus in LXX is concerned, it appears to be the result of the desire to explain Abiathar's presence in Keilah, or, more specifically, to emphasize the fact that he was still there with David. In the MT construction, בָּרַח אֲבִיתָר ... אֶל-דָּוִד, which refers to Abiathar's flight to David in 22:20, does not necessarily mean that he was still with David in chapter 23. Abiathar appears, however, in v.9, when David asks him for the ephod, and LXX seems to have wanted to make clear the fact that he was still there by adding the remark in v.6 καὶ αὐτὸς μετὰ Δαυείδ. It was this clarifying addition, however, that led some commentators to see a case of homeoteleuton through the repetition of David's name here.

# 1 Sam 29:10

MT: וַעֲתָה הִשָּׁמַע בְּבִקְרִי וְעַבְדִּי אֲדֹנָיִךְ אֲשֶׁר-בָּאוּ אֵתְךָ וְהִשְׁכַּמְתָּם בְּבִקְרִי  
וְאֹרֹר לָכֶם וּלְכוּ

LXX<sup>B</sup>: καὶ νῦν ὀρθρίσον το πρῶι σου καὶ οἱ παῖδες τοῦ Κυρίου σου οἱ ἡκόντες μετὰ σου, καὶ πορευέσθε εἰς τὸν τόπον οὗ κατέστησα ὑμᾶς ἐκεῖ· καὶ λόγον λοιμὸν μὴ θῆς ἐν καρδίᾳ σου, ὅτι ἀγαθὸς σου ἐνώπιον μου· καὶ ὀρθρίσατε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ φωτίσατω ὑμῖν, καὶ πορευθήτε.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: καὶ νῦν ὀρθρίσον το πρῶι σου καὶ οἱ παῖδες σου οἱ ἡκόντες μετὰ σου, καὶ πορευέσθε εἰς τὸν τόπον οὗ κατέστησα ὑμᾶς ἐκεῖ· καὶ λόγον λοιμὸν μὴ θῆς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, ὅτι ἀγαθὸς σου ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς μου, ὡς ἀγγέλους θεοῦ. ἐν ὁδῷ ὀρθρίσατε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ φωτίσατε ὑμῖν καὶ πορευθήτε.

In MT for 1 Sam 29:10 the close repetition of Achish's order to David to "rise up in the morning" appears far from satisfactory, while the presence of a significant plus in LXX alleviates this difficulty. Already Thenius proposed the originality of this long plus which has been widely accepted.<sup>167</sup> Its authenticity has been rejected, however, by Keil, Erdmann, Gressmann, Schulz, de Boer, Stoebe, RSV, TOB, Eü.

The plus as found in OL<sup>V</sup> (Et nunc ante lucem surge tu, et pueri tui, qui venerunt tecum; et ite in locum ubi constitui vobis. Et verbum pestilentiorum noli ponere in corde tuo quoniam bonus es tu in conspectu meo [Alias: et verbum pestilens, verbum diaboli ne ponas in corde tuo]) agrees with Ant at et pueri tui, but otherwise follows cod B.

Vg here basically follows MT's shorter text, although it appears to have translated freely in order to interpret MT where it is difficult to understand: Igitur consurge mane tu et servi domini tui qui venerunt tecum et cum de nocte surrexeritis et coeperit delucesere pergite. Tg and Syr follow MT as well, although both paraphrase partially. Tg replaced וינהר לכוך וחילון ואור לכם ולכו with וינהר לכוך וחילון, while Syr replaced והשכמתם בנקר with b'wrh', "on the way".<sup>168</sup>

Josephus seems to have been aware of at least part of the LXX plus, although he expresses it rather freely: "Now then, go within a day's time to the place which I have given thee, and suspect nothing untoward. There keep guard for me over the country, lest any of the enemy invade it."<sup>169</sup>

167 Wellhausen, Löhr, Budde, Nowack, Smith, Driver, Peters, Kittel, Dhorme, Graetz, Hertzberg, McCarter, Barthélemy, NEB, NAB, BJ, Osty.

168 De Boer relates this to Syr's omission of והשכמתם בנקר ("Research into the Text of Samuel XVIII-XXXI," Oudtestamentische Studiën, Deel VI [1949], p. 87). It may well be related to LXX as well, where εν τη οδω has replaced בנקר.

169 Ant. VI, 355, which reflects LXX και φυλασσειν την γην των αλλοφυλων against MT לשוב אל-ארץ פלשתים as well.

The absence of this plus from MT is attributed to a variety of causes by those who accept LXX. Löhr<sup>170</sup> blamed it on the similarity of והשכחם בנקר and השכח בנקר, although as Schulz pointed out, such an oversight should have caused אחך to have fallen out as well.<sup>171</sup> McCarter gets around this objection by proposing a textual corruption in three stages: 1) an original בירך (cf. LXX εὖ) became בנקר under the influence of the earlier one in the verse; 2) a long haplography occurred from בנקר השכח to בנקר; 3) some of the lost material was "partially restored, w'bdy 'dnyk 'šr b'w 'tk being added from another ms."<sup>172</sup> In addition to the difficulty of seeing such a complicated explanation here, however, it is hard to see why, if the material could be "partially restored" from another ms, the entire missing passage was not restored.

In any event, the MT shows that if an accident has occurred, it can not be attributed to simple homeoteleuton. Ordinarily when such an accident occurs, one of the repeated words or phrases drops out of the mutilated text, but the presence of both השכח בנקר and והשכחם בנקר shows that this is clearly not the case here.

Barthélemy ascribes the loss to "quasi-homéoarcton", from והלכתם to והשכחם,<sup>173</sup> although this seems to be a rather fragile basis for the loss of so many words. Thenius, Wellhausen, Driver, Dhorme (1910), de Vaux (BJ<sup>1</sup>) and Hertzberg give no reason for the loss of the passage.

Gressmann suggested that the entire first part of MT v.10 is an addition, and he read, for the entire verse, "Macht euch morgen in aller Frühe auf und geht, sobald es Tag wird!"<sup>174</sup> Schulz, on the other hand, accepted only the

170 Followed by Nowack, Budde, Smith, Peters, Dhorme (1956).

171 Schulz I, p. 399.

172 McCarter, p. 426.

173 Barthélemy, CTAT, although with a grade of "D".

174 H. Gressmann, Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels, 2nd. edition (Göttingen, 1921), p. 108.

first half of the verse, as it appears in MT, as original, claiming that a repetition is a sign that what lies in between is an insertion. On the strength of the correspondence between *השכם* in v.10a and *וישכם* in v.11, he designated v.10a as original and v.10b as a secondary reading.<sup>175</sup>

De Boer refers to the LXX plus as a "midrashic expatiation,"<sup>176</sup> and is followed by Stoebe, who maintains, however, that it does go back to a Hebrew original in LXX's *Vorlage*.<sup>177</sup>

It seems difficult to maintain that MT witnesses to an entirely original text as it stands. The absence of *אח* before *ועני* hardly seems possible,<sup>178</sup> nor does the repetition of *והשכמתם בנקר* appear to be the original text. Wellhausen maintained that this second imperative is explicable only as the resumption of the thought after a digression such as is provided in the Greek text.<sup>179</sup> The Greek here, however, is itself open to suspicion, as two of its three phrases merely echo what has already been expressed earlier.

In v.4, the commanders of the Philistines order Achish: *השב את-האיש וישב אל-מקומו אשר הפקדתו שם*, rendered in LXX as *ἀποστρεφον τον ανδρα*<sup>180</sup> *εις τον τοπον αυτου ου κατεστησας αυτον εκει*. In v.6, we find *כי-ישר אתה וטוב בעיני* and v.9, *כי טוב אתה בעיני כמלאך אלהים*, rendered respectively as *οτι ευθης συ και αγαθος εν οφθαλμοις μου*, and *οτι αγαθος συ εν οφθαλμοις*,<sup>181</sup> which indicates Achish's attitude toward

175 Schulz I, p. 400.

176 De Boer, "Research...", p. 87.

177 Stoebe, p. 499.

178 Driver shows that such an omission is "contrary to standing Hebrew usage, when the verb is in the imperative," (e.g. Gen 7:1; Ex 11:8; 24:1), p. 220.

179 Wellhausen, p. 143.

180 In mss B d y a<sub>2</sub>. The remaining mss add *και αποστραφητω*.

181 Mss A b c<sub>2</sub> add *καθως αγγελος θεου* and c x *καθως αγγελος Κυριου*.

David. These are extremely similar to the plus of v.10:...  
 εις το τοπον ου κατεστησα υμας εκει, and οτι αγαθος συ ενωπιον  
 μου.

The remaining clause of the plus, και λογον λοιμον  
 μη θης εν καρδια σου, has no equivalent in the surrounding  
 verses, or elsewhere in the Bible. In the Greek text of  
 1 Samuel the adjective λοιμος occurs six times (1:16; 2:12;  
 10:27; 25:17.25; 30:22), always a translation of לַעֲלִי, but  
 always with a personal subject. Outside of 1 Sam, λοιμος  
 occurs twenty-one times, but is never used to translate  
 לַעֲלִי.<sup>182</sup>

The word לַעֲלִי occurs twenty-seven times in MT:  
 six in 1 Sam (see above), always translated by λοιμος; four  
 in 2 Sam, translated thrice by παρανομος (16:7; 20:1 [λοιμος  
 in b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>]; 23:6 [λοιποι in b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> OL<sup>v183</sup>]); and once  
 by ανομα (22:5). In 1 Kgs it occurs three times (21:10.13.  
 13), and once in 2 Chr 13:7, translated by παρανομος.

The expressions לַעֲלִי דָּבָר, found at Pss 41:9 (λογον  
 λοιμον) and 101:3 (πραγμα παρανομον) and לַעֲלִי בְּלִבְךָ-עַד דָּבָר  
 (ρημα κρυπτον εν τη καρδια σου ανομημα) at Dt 15:19, insure  
 the genuine Hebrew character of this term.

Further, as far as μη θης εν καρδια σου is con-  
 cerned, Barthélemy emphasizes the fact that the expression  
 בְּלִבְךָ דָּבָר הוּא at 1 Sam 21:13, in a very different context from  
 that of 29:10, is a sign of the expression's originality  
 here.<sup>184</sup>

All of these indications taken together make it  
 seem certain that the expression και λογον λοιμον μη θης εν  
 τη καρδια σου goes back to the Hebrew Vorlage of LXX.

The prepositional phrase ενωπιον μου in cod B and  
 the variant in Ant, εν οφθαλμοις μου, are, however, anomalous  
 and difficult to explain. Since in vv.6, 7, and 9 we find

182 At 2 Sam 20:1, mss b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> read λοιμος for cod B  
 παρανομος.

183 At 2 Sam 23:6, λοιποι in Ant may be a corruption of  
 λοιμοι.

184 Barthélemy, CTAT.

εν οφθαλμοις for יָגִיד, it is surprising that cod B, which should ordinarily represent OG here, would contain ενωπιον. R. Sollamo has concluded that "the KR introduced a novel translation technique by using εν οφθαλμοις almost invariably for יָגִיד, whether the referent was Yahweh or a person,"<sup>185</sup> but then goes on to say, "This novelty was, however, only relative, since the rendering εν οφθαλμοις was already in great favour in α'."<sup>186</sup> Since εν οφθαλμοις occurs here in Ant and ενωπιον in cod B, we cannot attribute the transformation to the kaigé recensional activity, nor can we attribute with certainty the other uses of εν οφθαλμοις, in vv.6, 7, and 9, to a change from an original ενωπιον such has occurred in the kaigé section. The expression יָגִיד/יָגִיד occurs eleven times in 1 Samuel:

	<u>cod B</u>	<u>b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub></u>	<u>other mss</u>
1:23	εν οφθαλμοις	ενωπιον	εν οφθαλμοις rell.
3:18	ενωπιον	<u>ibid.</u>	εναντιον γ; εν οφθαλμοις Ne n
11:10	ενωπιον	<u>ibid.</u>	εν οφθαλμοις c x
14:36	ενωπιον	<u>ibid.</u>	εν οφθαλμοις e f m s w
14:40	ενωπιον	<u>ibid.</u>	εν οφθαλμοις a e f m s w
18:5	---	ενωπιον	εν οφθαλμοις A+
18:5	---	εν οφθαλμοις	εν οφθαλμοις A+
24:5	εν οφθαλμοις	<u>ibid.</u>	<u>ibid.</u>
29:6	εν οφθαλμοις	<u>ibid.</u>	<u>ibid.</u>
29:6	εν οφθαλμοις	<u>ibid.</u>	<u>ibid.</u>
29:9	εν οφθαλμοις	<u>ibid.</u>	<u>ibid.</u>
(29:10	ενωπιον	εν οφθαλμοις ενωπιον	rell.)

Thus there is no evidence of a systematic correction in 1 Sam. Ενωπιον in 29:10 may simply represent a rendering

185 R. Sollamo, Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint (Helsinki, 1979), p. 145. This modification in kaigé occurs even when there is no Hebrew text at its base, as 2 Kgs 21:9 shows: LXX του ποιησαι το πονηρον εν οφθαλμοις (ενωπιον in b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>) Κυριου υπερ τα εθνη for MT יָגִיד לְהַחֲדִיחַ לְפָנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ וְלִפְנֵי הָעָם.

186 Sollamo, Renderings, p. 145.



in the early Greek by a translator for whom consistency was not a necessity. The inconsistency between it and εν οφθαλμοῖς in vv.6, 7, and 9 suggests that ενωπιον in cod B was the original and that εν οφθαλμοῖς in Ant was a later, harmonizing correction. That εν οφθαλμοῖς in vv.6, 7, and 9 were originally ενωπιον and were later modified to εν οφθαλμοῖς is a possibility, but there is no evidence for this outside the kaigé recension and, as R. Sollamo has pointed out, εν οφθαλμοῖς was already in great favour in α'."

All those commentators who provide a Hebrew retroversion for this plus employ the preposition לפני<sup>187</sup> save Nowack and Graetz, who have suggested בעיני in conformity with vv. 6 and 9. The expression לפני (אנה) טוב, however, is found only at Neh 2:5.6; Est 5:14; Qoh 2:26; 7:26; and 2 Chr 31:20, and is a later equivalent for בעיני (אנה) טיב.<sup>188</sup> If we are to accept an original לפני in the Hebrew Vorlage here, it would almost certainly have to be considered a later, even though Hebrew, addition. On the other hand, both ενωπιον and εν οφθαλμοῖς are used for בעיני in Sam-Kgs.<sup>189</sup>

187 Thenius, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Driver, Budde, Dhorme, Kittel, McCarter, HOTTP.

188 Cf. BDB, s. פנה: "לפני...(late syn. of earlier בעיני)."

189 In cod B the occurrences of these prepositions are:

	α'	ββ'	βγ'	γγ'	γδ'
ενωπιον	9	5	0	16	5
εν οφθαλμοῖς	19	4	17	0	30

The variants between B and Ant for בעיני are instructive, especially for the kaigé sections:

ενωπιον in B					
= εν οφθ. Ant	0	0	0	0	0
εν οφθ. in B					
= ενωπιον Ant	2	0	10	0	22

The figures at βγ' and γδ' show that where Ant=OG, an original ενωπιον has been frequently modified to εν οφθαλμοῖς in kaigé. An original εν οφθαλμοῖς, on the other hand, is never modified to ενωπιον by kaigé.

It seems most likely, therefore, to accept בָּעֵינִי as the preposition used in LXX's Vorlage, which was originally translated as ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς in order to bring it into conformity with vv. 6, 7, and 9.

While this plus seems definitely to have been found in a Hebrew form which served as LXX's Vorlage, the question of its originality is not yet answered. We have seen the repetitious material in two out of the three clauses, which could have been inspired by the surrounding verses. It was however, the immediate repetition of the order "Arise in the morning" which caused Wellhausen to seek some intervening material. It is the nature of this repetition which must be examined.

S. Talmon, in his article on "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text,"<sup>190</sup> has suggested a classification of variant readings in MT which he calls "synonomous readings."<sup>191</sup> Among the various forms which these synonomous readings may take, he notes, "There are many double readings [in MT] in which one of the alternatives is placed outside the syntactical context and stands at the end of the sentence or next to the caesura."<sup>192</sup> Since the text of MT for 1 Sam 29:10 is disturbed precisely at the two places where the order is given, and repeated, by Achish for David and his men, it may be that we have evidence of a double reading in MT here. For the beginning of the verse, both ... והשכנתם בבקר אהא ועבדי<sup>193</sup> and השכנתם בבקר אהא ועבדי could

190 S. Talmon, "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text," Textus 1 (1960) 144-184.

191 Talmon, "Double Readings...", p. 146.

192 He points out that even though the caesura is "of late origin, the division of the sentence into hemistichs was undoubtedly known to ancient scribes" ("Double Readings...", p. 160, note 37).

193 For the initial waw here, cf. Talmon: "In some cases, where the doublet disturbs the normal grammatical structure of the verse, the scribe has seen fit to iron out the resulting difficulties by easing the transition from one alternative reading to the other with the aid

have existed as early variants here. Of the two, the first one, with the verb in the singular, may have been considered preferable because of the continuation in v.11 ...וַיִּשְׁכֶּם דָּוִד, and the other relegated to the end of the syntactic unit which describes David's men. Such a process would also account for the repetition of בְּנִקְר, which hardly seems necessary otherwise, and which LXX changed to εἰς τὴν οἰκάν, probably in order to insure a more logical progression in the narrative. The hypothesis of a double reading here may account for the loss of אָמָא as well, which could have accidentally fallen out in the process of putting the two readings together.

If it is true that a double reading occurs here, it must be considered to have taken place at an early stage, in the pre-MT, as the presence of both καὶ σὺν ὀφθρίσιν and καὶ ὀφθρίσιν in LXX indicates. The Vorlage of LXX may have been puzzled by the immediate repetition of the order to rise in the morning, and supplied Achish with a lengthier speech to David which repeated both the commanders' instructions to Achish on what to tell David ("Send the man back that he may return to the place you have assigned him" [v.4] -- this is, in fact, not necessary at v.10 since Achish had already told David to return in v.7), and Achish's own protestation of confidence in David from vv.6 and 9. The result of this longer LXX text is one which separates the two members of the double reading more smoothly than the text of MT.

Thus, for this verse we have two possibilities. The phrase καὶ λόγον λοιμὸν μὴ θῆς ἐν καρδίᾳ σου in the LXX plus seems to insure that the plus was part of its Vorlage and the fact that the expression is not found elsewhere may be a sign of the text's originality here. On the other hand, the shorter MT may witness to a pre-MT which already contained a double reading into which LXX's Vorlage inserted an addition both to relieve the syntactical harshness and to

---

of connective words, such as the copulative waw, the conjunctions אֲשֶׁר, אִם, and the like ("Double Readings...", p. 160, note 37).

specify Achish's order to David. No accident of haplography can account for MT's shorter text whereas the repeated imperative could have given a creative scribe the pretext he needed to insert additional material, where the resulting text would seem to have occasioned a haplography in MT. For this verse, the reasons both for and against the originality of the LXX plus seem so evenly balanced that a final decision is not possible, although the evidence seems to favor the originality of MT.

1 Sam 30:24

MT: וְמִי יִשְׁמַע לָכֵם לְדַבֵּר הַזֶּה כִּי כָחֵלַק הִירָד בַּמִּלְחָמָה וּכְחֵלַק הַיֶּשֶׁב  
עַל-הַכִּלִּים...

LXX<sup>B</sup>: καὶ τις ὑπακούσεται ὑμῶν τῶν λόγων τούτων· ὅτι οὐχ  
ἦττον ὑμῶν εἰσὶν· διότι κατὰ τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κατα-  
βαίνοντος εἰς πόλεμον οὕτως ἐστὶ μερίς καθημένου  
ἐπὶ τὰ σκευή...

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: καὶ τις ἀκούσεται τῶν λόγων ὑμῶν τούτων, ὅτι οὐχ  
ἦττους ἡμῶν εἰσὶν; διὰ τοῦτο κατὰ τὴν μερίδα τοῦ  
καταβάντος εἰς τὸν πόλεμον, οὕτως ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ μερίς  
τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τὰ σκευή...

In 1 Sam 30:21-25 David defends the right of the two hundred, who had been too exhausted to follow him beyond the brook of Beser, to receive the spoils of the Amalekites on an equal basis with the others. In v.24 LXX contains a small plus in which David says, "For they are not less important than you" (cod B). The plus is in all Greek mss, although several witnesses, including Ant and OL<sup>V</sup>, read ἦττους for cod B ἦττον,<sup>194</sup> and a large number read ἡμῶν for ὑμῶν.<sup>195</sup>

The plus was accepted as original by Thenius, who gives the retroversion as כִּי לֹא קָלוּ מִמֶּנּוּ לָכֵן, and blames the absence from MT on an accidental oversight from כִּי to לָכֵן.<sup>196</sup> Klostermann also accepted the originality of LXX, with a different retroversion: יַמְעִיטוּ מִמֶּנּוּ, blaming the

194 Mss b e f i m o s w z c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> OL<sup>V</sup>.

195 Mss b c d e h<sup>corr</sup> i m o p q s t w x\* z a<sub>2</sub> c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> OL<sup>V</sup>.

196 Thenius<sup>2</sup>, p. 135.

loss in MT on homeoarcton at כִּי and referring to Ex 16:17 ff. for a parallel situation.<sup>197</sup> It must be noted that all of these who accept LXX read שָׁמַח with Ant.<sup>198</sup> Only Graetz, who read לֹא נִגְרָעוּ מִכֵּן, followed cod B.<sup>199</sup>

By far the majority of commentators has either rejected this plus as an expansion in LXX,<sup>200</sup> or has passed it over without comment.<sup>201</sup> Nor does it appear in any modern translation.

The possibility of accidental omission through homeoarcton may be materially present here, as McCarter points out, although this is one of the few haplographies or pseudo-haplographies which he does not accept as genuine.<sup>202</sup> This plus is small and not notably significant for the narrative, but the way it has been treated in the commentaries is instructive. It is either accepted or rejected with no discussion, and those who have chosen, again without discussion or justification, to accept it as genuine, restore the passage according to a secondary Greek recension since it apparently fits better in the context.

The fact that out of five authors who accept the plus, four different verbs or verb forms are suggested for the retroversion of ἡττον...εἰσεν should already be a sign that the expression is definitely more Greek than Hebrew and that an equivalent in Hebrew is hard to find. The comparative ἡττων (ἡσσων) appears in the Greek Bible only at Job 5:4; 13:10; 20:10; Wis 17:13; Is 23:8; Ep. Jer 36; Dan 2:39 (Theodotion's text); and six times in 2 Macc. At Job 20:10 εἰσεν is rendered ἡττονας and Dan 2:39 מִנֶּחַ אֲרָא and Dan 2:39 מִנֶּחַ אֲרָא.

197 Peters, suggesting וַיִּמְעַן, and Dhorme followed him, although the latter abandoned the correction in 1956 to read with MT.

198 Peters (p. 135) claimed that שָׁמַח in cod B had been influenced by the beginning of the verse.

199 Graetz, p. 23.

200 Erdmann, Budde, Kittel, Schulz, Stoebe.

201 Keil, Wellhausen, Hummelauer, Smith, Driver, Nowack, Ehrlich, Hertzberg, McCarter.

202 McCarter, p. 433.

Outside of these two occurrences, it either has no Hebrew base (Job 5:4; Wis 17:13; Ep. Jer 36; 2 Macc), or the Hebrew bears no relation to the Greek (Job 13:10 ουθεν ητιον for הוכח יוכיח; Is 23:8 μη ησσω εσσει for המעטירה). The task of finding an adequate retroversion here seems, therefore, reduced to guesswork, and it seems much more likely that the expression is of Greek origin.

Erdmann suggested that the addition was made because of the short statement at the end of the verse, "They shall share alike," in order to apply the specific circumstances to the general rule.<sup>203</sup> Such an addition would not be out of keeping with a common LXX tendency to explain and clarify.

It seems justified, therefore, to consider this plus an expansion by LXX, whose imaginary retroversion appears to have created the possibility of an accident due to homeoarcton.

## 2 Sam 13:21

MT: ...וְלֹא<sup>22</sup> וְהַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד אָמַע אֶת כָּל-הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה וַיַּחַר לוֹ מְאֹד

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ηκουσεν ο βασιλευς Δαυειδ παντας τους λογους τουτους και εθυμωθη σφοδρα· και ουκ ελυπησεν το πνευμα Αμνων του υιου αυτου, οτι ηγαπα αυτον, οτι πρωτοτοκος αυτου ην.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ο βασιλευς Δαυειδ ηκουσεν παντας τους λογους τουτους και ηθυμησεν σφοδρα, και ουκ ελυπησεν το πνευμα Αμνων του υιου αυτου, οτι ηγαπα αυτον, οτι πρωτοτοκος αυτου ην.

<sup>204</sup>  
4QSam<sup>a</sup>: [וְהַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד] שָׁמַע אֹהֵל [כֹּחַ] ]  
[הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה וַיַּחַר לוֹ מְאֹד וְלֹא עָצַב אֶת רוּחַ אֲמֹנֹן בְּנוֹ כִּי אִהָּבָה לוֹ] [הוּא]

In 2 Sam 13:21, which describes David's reaction upon learning of Amnon's behavior toward Tamar, LXX adds, "And he did not trouble the spirit of Amnon his son, for he loved him because he was his firstborn." The plus is present in all Greek mss, where the only significant variant is ηθυμησεν (M[mg] b o z[mg] c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>) for εθυμωθη. OL<sup>v</sup> here follows the

203 Erdmann p. 330.

204 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 84.

majority of the mss (et iratus factus est valde, et non contristavit spiritum Amnon filii sui, quoniam amabat eum, quoniam primogenitus erat ei) with its reading of iratus est.

From Houbigant on, the majority of commentators has accepted the plus as original,<sup>205</sup> blaming its absence from MT on an accident through homeoarcton at וְלֵאמֹר which begins the plus and which begins v.22 as well. Thenius proposed the following retroversion, which has subsequently been accepted by all: וְלֵאמֹר עָצַב אֶת-רוּחַ אֲמֹנֹן בְּנוֹ כִּי אָהָבוֹ כִּי בָכְרוֹ הוּא.<sup>206</sup>

Wellhausen argued, in favor of the plus, that David's anger "must either be released or reasons had to be given why it subsided,"<sup>207</sup> although he claimed that it was not possible to determine how the passage had fallen out of the text.

Not all, however, have accepted its originality here. Vercellone held simply that no adequate argument for its acceptance could be put forth, and cited a marginal note from the Latin Ms. Vat. 3466: "Est quasi anthipophora, qua respondetur obiectione, quae posset fieri: si scivit pater, et valde doluit, quare ergo non vindicavit?",<sup>208</sup> which seems to have anticipated Wellhausen's argument in its favor. Keil concluded that the reason given in the plus for David's failure to punish Amnon is probably correct, but maintained nonetheless that it is a "subjective conjecture" on the part of LXX.<sup>209</sup>

Graetz and Driver were undecided about the authenticity of the plus, and Driver commented that "the words, if a gloss, are at any rate an instructive one."<sup>210</sup>

As MT stands, it is grammatically correct, yet the verse seems short, even for MT's characteristically more

205 Ewald, Thenius, Wellhausen, Böttcher, Löhr, Klostermann, Smith, Nowack, Peters, Dhorme, Kittel, Hertzberg, HOTTP, NEB, NAB, BJ, Osty.

206 Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 186.

207 Wellhausen, p. 187.

208 Vercellone, p. 374. Keil, Erdmann, Hummelauer, Ehrlich, Schulz, RSV, TOB, Eü likewise reject it.

209 Keil, p. 290.

210 Driver, p. 301.

direct narrative. Ulrich has pointed out the agreement between 4Q and LXX here in order to uphold the plus's originality.<sup>211</sup>

The expression λυπειν το πνευμα, encountered in the plus, may be said to have a Hebrew "flavor", although it occurs elsewhere only at Tob 4:3 (Sinaiticus). It is not possible to judge, however, if this expression is the literal translation of a Semitic original.<sup>212</sup> Thenius had proposed נָעַץ as the verb which lay behind ελυπησεν, although this verb translates נָעַץ only at Gen 45:5 (נָעַץ אֶל - וּסוּן סוּן מִן לִי לִי לִי) and 2 Sam 19:3 (נָעַץ הַמֶּלֶךְ עַל-בְּנוֹ - λυπείται ο βασιλευς επι τω υιω αυτου). Both verbs here are in niphal, and are not used with הוּא. At Isa 54:6 we find הוּא יִנְחָם (και ολιγοψυχον), and at Isa 63:10 קָדְשׁוֹ הוּא-אֵל-יִנְחָם (και παρωξυναν το πνευμα το αγιον αυτου). נָעַץ is more commonly used without as internal part of the person as object,<sup>213</sup> and it appears only at Isa 54:6 and 63:10 with הוּא, as mentioned above, plus once, at Gen 6:6 in hithpael with לוֹ. If הוּא-אֵל נָעַץ, as Thenius suggested, is a faithful retroversion, it would be the only occurrence of this verb in qal with הוּא.

211 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 84.

212 For Tob 4:3, codd B A rell read και μη λυπησῃς αὐτήν. OL text, however, reads et noli contristare spiritum eius along with Codex Sinaiticus (Cf. Brooke, McLean, Thackeray, The Old Testament in Greek. Vol. III, Part I. Esther, Judith, Tobit (London, 1940). An Aramaic version, found in a 15th century ms (cf. A. Neubauer, The Book of Tobit Oxford, [1878]) reads וְלֹא תַחֲמַר עַל מִימֵר פִּיָּהּ "and oppose not the word of her mouth." Neubauer also gives a Hebrew text, the so-called Münster Text (cf. Neubauer, p. xii), which supposedly dates to the 8th or 9th century, which reads וְלֹא תַחֲמַר אֶת חַיֵּיהָ -- "and make not her life bitter." The phrase is absent from the Vg. From the Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew texts, however, it is difficult to judge what an original Hebrew expression might have been here.

213 Cf. 1 Sam 20:3.34; 2 Sam 19:3; Gen 45:5; Neh 8:10.11; Qoh 10:9 (all in niphal); Ps 56:6 (piel); Ps 78:40 (hiphil); Gen 34:7 (hithpael). The verb in qal appears at 1 Kgs 1:6 and 1 Chr 4:10.



It has been suggested that 1 Kgs 1:6 confirms the authenticity of the LXX at 2 Sam 13:21.<sup>214</sup> In the text in Kgs, we are told that David never displeased, or vexed, his son Adonijah (וְלֹא עָצַר), because he was born next after Absalom.<sup>215</sup> Aside from the fact that אֶם-רָוּחַ is not used with עָצַר here, this is the type of argument which may be used either way, as the expression in 2 Sam 13:21 is partially confirmed by 1 Kgs 1:6, but the thought that is expressed is so similar that one of the texts could have influenced the other, especially by a scribe who wanted to establish a certain harmony between texts describing similar situations. The two texts are, in fact, placed together in the Midrash Rabbah for Ecclesiastes where, commenting on Eccl 7:3 (קִרְיָהּ כֵּס כֶּסֶף טוֹב - ἀγαθὸν θυμὸς ὑπὲρ γέλῳτα), it notes

Solomon said: If my father had been a little vexed with Adonijah it would have been better for him than the laughter with which the Attribute of Justice gloated over him.... It was the same with Amnon; If his father David had been a little vexed with him, it would have been better for him that the laughter with which the Attribute of Justice gloated over him.<sup>216</sup>

In addition to noting the similarity of these two cases, the Midrash here is somewhat surprising when it says that David was not vexed with Amnon. At 2 Sam 13:21, the text of MT clearly says וַיַּחַר לוֹ מְאֹד. The text of OG, however,

<sup>214</sup> Cf. Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 186.

<sup>215</sup> LXX codd B A here read καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκώλυσεν αὐτόν, but Ant has οὐκ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ. The reading of B A has caused many commentators to emend to עָצַר (e.g. Klostermann), but G. R. Driver has shown the plausibility, based on the Arabic ~~عَصَرَ~~ I. "reviled", III. "prevented", that עָצַר lies at the basis of both Greek verbs (G. R. Driver, "Supposed Arabisms in the Old Testament," JBL 55[1936] 101-120). Josephus perhaps knew of both forms for 1 Kgs 1:6, as he has here οὐκ ἐπελήττειν οὐδ' ἐπέχειν αὐτόν -- "he did not rebuke him nor restrain him" (Ant. VII, 346). Benzinger (*Die Bücher der Könige* [Freiburg i. B., 1899] p. 3) begs the question, however, by asserting that עָצַר in 1 Kgs 1:6 is assured by 2 Sam 13:21.

<sup>216</sup> Ecclesiastes (trans. A. Cohen) in *Midrash Rabbah*. Vol. VIII, edited by H. Freedman and M. Simon (London, 1939), p. 178.

preserved in mss b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> reads ηθυμῆσεν for cod B εθυμωθη.<sup>217</sup> חרה is translated by αθυμειν elsewhere only at 1 Sam 15:11 and 2 Sam 6:8 (= 1 Chr 13:11). In both of these cases, LXX may have used the verb euphemistically, since in each case in question of someone's anger against God.<sup>218</sup> It is only at 2 Sam 13:21 that αθυμειν translates חרה when the anger is not directed toward God. Whether LXX has made an insertion here or not, it seems at least to have modified the thought of the passage, so that David is no longer angered by Amnon's action, but rather is saddened.

In this case, therefore, it seems difficult to arrive at a clear decision concerning the authenticity of this plus. The material possibility of an accident through homeoarcton is definitely present and the material contained within the plus fits in well with the narrative. On the other hand, the sentence in MT makes good sense grammatically, and the similarity with the case of Adonijah in 1 Kgs 1:6 leaves open the possibility that the plus is a later, harmonizing addition to the text. It was hardly in keeping with David's character that his anger not lead to some sort of action and LXX or its Vorlage may have felt that such inactivity on his part needed explanation. The presence of the plus in 4Q indicates that it most likely was found in LXX's Hebrew Vorlage as well, but I suggest that it is not possible here to determine, on the merits of the plus alone, whether it should be considered original to the narrative or not.

---

217 Vg here contains contristatus est, with the exception of Cod. Paris. Bibl. Nat. lat. 11937 (6<sup>th</sup> in the San Girolamo edition), which reads iratus est.

218 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 218. Jerome seems to have been partially influenced by the LXX translation, or perhaps by traditional rabbinic interpretation, for he translates חרה as contristatus at 1 Sam 15:11; 2 Sam 6:8; 13:21; 1 Chr 13:11, but as iratus at Gen 4:5; Jon 4:4.9.9; Neh 5:6.

2 Sam 13:27

MT: ויפרץ-בו אבשלום וישלח אתו את-אמנון ואת כל-בני המלך

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και εβιασατο αυτον Αβεσσαλωμ, και απεστειλεν μετ' αυτου τον Αμνων και παντας τους υιους του βασιλεως· και εποιησεν Αβεσσαλωμ ποτον κατα τον ποτον του βασιλεως.

4QSam<sup>a</sup>:<sup>219</sup> ויעש אבשלום משתה כמשתה ה[מלך] וי[ש]לח אתו אמנון וכל בני המלך ]  
...י[<sup>28</sup>]

In this verse, after David, at Absalom's insistence, allows Amnon and his brothers to go with him to the sheep-shearers at Baal-Hazor, the LXX contains a plus which tells us that Absalom gave a kingly banquet for Amnon.

Here the text of Ant contains no significant variant from that of cod B, and the plus of LXX is present in OL<sup>S</sup> as well. The fragments of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> allow us only a peek here at what its text might have been, as, immediately preceding v.28 the text reads ]י[ל]מ[, and Ulrich notes that "there is a gap of 1/2 line in 4Q which is perfectly filled with the plus as reconstructed from G."<sup>220</sup> Vg, Tg, and Syr contain the shorter text in agreement with MT.

By far the majority of commentators from Thenius on accept the originality of the plus, as it appears to make the necessary link between the arrival of the sons of David and Absalom's command to kill Amnon "when his heart is merry with wine" (v.28). In this case, its loss from MT would have been due to an accident of homeoteleuton at the repeated המלך.<sup>221</sup>

Very few have rejected the plus here, although Keil claimed that it was a gloss inspired by 1 Sam 25:36,<sup>222</sup> and Vercellone maintained that it was not easily possible to prove that the plus was originally in the text.<sup>223</sup> Nowack

219 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 85.

220 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 85.

221 Thus Thenius, Böttcher, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Smith, Budde, Peters, Dhorme, Kittel, Hertzberg, NEB, NAB, BJ, Osty, Eü, HOTTP.

222 Keil, p. 29, followed by Erdmann, RSV, TOB.

223 Vercellone, p. 375.

characterized the plus as "wahrscheinlich,"<sup>224</sup> while Löhr, Driver and Schulz did not commit themselves on its authenticity.

The only other time that a king's banquet is used as a simile in the Bible is, as Keil pointed out, at 1 Sam 25:36, where Nabal's banquet is described: **והנה לו-משתה** **והנה לו-משתה המלך**.<sup>225</sup> These are the only two instances of the expression, and in both cases the banquet is somehow fatal for its principal participant after it is noted that "his heart was merry" (**בליב טוב** in 1 Sam 25:36; **בליב טוב** in 2 Sam 13:28).

It is possible that LXX found it illogical that Amnon's heart was merry with wine if no meal was referred to in the account, and it could have supplied the missing element based on the story of Nabal. Just as in the case of 2 Sam 13:21, the plus appears at the end of the sentence, almost tacked on to the verse, and its absence in MT leaves no grammatical scar. Again as in 13:21, however, the material possibility of haplography is clearly present and the plus makes good sense in its context. Here again, therefore, it does not seem possible to determine which form, MT or LXX, contains the original reading here.

#### 2 Sam 13:34b

MT: **וישא הנער הצפה את-עיניו וירא והנה עם-רב הלכים מדרך אחריה**  
מצד ההר

<sup>224</sup> Nowack, p. 202.

<sup>225</sup> Cod B\* for 1 Sam 25:36 reads **και ιδου αυτω ποτος βασιλεως**. Ant has **και ιδου ην αυτω ποτος ως ο ποτος των βασιλεων εν τω οικω αυτου**, while B<sup>ab</sup> A M N rell read, with minor variations, **και ιδου αυτω ποτος εν οικω αυτου ως ποτος βασιλεως**, showing a haplography in B\* occasioned by the repetition of **ποτος**.

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ηρεν το παιδαριον ο σκοπος τους οφθαλμους αυτου, και ειδεν και ιδου λαος πολυς πορευομενος εν τη οδω οπισθεν αυτου εκ πλευρας του ορους εν τη καταβασει. και παρεγενετο ο σκοπος και απηγγειλεν τω βασιλει και ειπεν Ανδρας εωρακα εκ της οδου της Ωρωνην εκ μερους του ορους.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ανεβη το παιδαριον ο σκοπος, και ηρεν τους οφθαλμους αυτου και ειδεν, και ιδου λαος πολυς πορευομενος την οδον την Σωραιμ εκ μερους του ορους εν τη καταβασει. και παρεγενετο ο σκοπος και απηγγειλεν τω βασιλει και ειπεν Ωρων εωρακα ανδρες εκ της οδου της Σωραιμ εκ μερους του ορους.

This LXX plus which contains the watchman's report to David has been almost universally accepted as genuine since it supplies the desiderated report and at the same time eliminates the grammatically singular מַרְאֵה of MT.

Wellhausen supplied the explanation here to which the majority of commentators has adhered.<sup>226</sup> He maintained, first of all, that the sentence και παρεγενετο ... εκ μερους του ορους is unquestionably part of the genuine OG, but the preceding section, from και ηρεν το εν καταβασει poses several problems. First, οδος της Ωρωνην = מַרְאֵה הָרֵךְ, which is identical with מַרְאֵה הָרֵךְ (the final mem being from the following מַעַן). LXX<sup>B</sup>, however, with οπισθεν αυτου, could hardly have read this correctly the second time but wrongly the first. Next, εκ πλευρας του ορους could not have been translated by the same person who later in the same verse has εκ μερους του ορους for מַעַן הָרֵךְ, in agreement with 1 Sam 23:26. Further, מַרְאֵה in MT, where LXX<sup>B</sup> has εν τη οδω, and εν καταβασει at the end of the sentence, show that this, in LXX, could not have been a simple translation of what is found in MT. He proposed the following solution. First, οπισθεν αυτου must be considered to stand for an original της Ωρωνην,<sup>227</sup> and εν τη καταβασει refers to מַרְאֵה הָרֵךְ of Josh 10:11. From this name in Josh, he reasons that the

226 Wellhausen, pp. 189 f.

227 Sic in Wellhausen, although no Greek ms gives this spelling. The form is taken from Josh 10:10 f.

Vorlage of LXX must have read חרונים, whose misreading gave rise to MT אחריו. Then, since in the second sentence, εὐ τῇ καταβασεῖ is not repeated, but rather εἰς μερὸς τοῦ οὐροῦ stands in its place, the LXX<sup>B</sup> εἰς πλεῖρας is not to be read as εἰς μερὸς, but is to be considered a "nach dem MT corrigierende Duplette zu εὐ καταβ.", and consequently should not be considered as part of the original OG. Thus Wellhausen's reconstruction of the Hebrew texts runs: ... הלכים בדרך חרונים ... במורד ויבא הצפה ויגד למלך ויאמר אנשים ראיתי מדרך חרונים מצד ההר.

This reconstruction is followed substantially by most commentators. Nowack, Budde, Driver and Dhorme accepted it as is. Smith proposed a second הלכים, after אנשים, "because without it the following מדרך is harsh, and its presence alone fully explains the error of the scribe."<sup>228</sup> Kittel suggested inserting ירדים after ראיתי.<sup>229</sup> Hertzberg and BJ read the place name as Bahurim, after 2 Sam 16:5, but then eliminate במורד in their later editions.<sup>230</sup> Dhorme likewise abandoned במורד in his 1956 edition. NEB read Horonaim here (although likewise without במורד). Graetz accepted the LXX plus, but emended the place name to אפרים.<sup>231</sup>

Keil rejected the plus on the grounds that this addition of the watchman's message makes the following verse unnecessary, when Jonadab says to David, "Behold, the king's sons have come."<sup>232</sup> Hummelauer maintained that there is no reason for supposing a corruption of אחריו into חרונים, and further, that Beth-horon is always elsewhere accompanied by בניה.<sup>233</sup> Schulz rejected the plus on the grounds that such a

228 Smith, p. 333.

229 Kittel, BH<sup>3</sup>.

230 Hertzberg, Die Samuelbücher (Göttingen, 1956) [Das Alte Testament Deutsch]: "den Abhang hinab"; idem, I and II Samuel (London, 1964): omit. BJ (1953; 21961): "à la descende"; BJ (31973): omit.

231 Graetz, p. 26.

232 Keil, p. 292, note 1.

233 Hummelauer, p. 364.

literal repetition is not usual, and that it conveys nothing new. As far as the form of MT is concerned, however, he took the Vg per iter devium ex latere montis to show that מִדֶּרֶךְ אֲחֵרִי represents an original מִדֶּרֶךְ אֲחֵר (cf. 1 Kgs 13:10) -- "a road other than the usual one."<sup>234</sup> RSV and Eü omit the plus but correct אֲחֵרִי to the place name Horonaim. TOB is practically alone in maintaining MT as it stands.

It is obvious, therefore, from this survey of opinions that there is little agreement on the precise reading to be adopted for this verse. In order to measure the worth of LXX here, we must begin as Wellhausen did, by attempting to determine the original OG. In the closing remarks of his textual commentary, Wellhausen chose this verse as an example of how the codices  $b o c_2 e_2$  can represent the OG. While  $\kappa\alpha\iota \alpha\nu\epsilon\beta\eta$  and  $\sigma\omega\nu \epsilon\omega\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha$  stand in these mss but not in cod B, he dismissed them as "eine für den Sinn unwesentliche concretere Färbung."<sup>235</sup> The main crux, however, seems to lie in Ant's  $\epsilon\kappa \mu\epsilon\rho\upsilon\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \epsilon\nu \tau\eta \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota$ . We have already seen that Wellhausen referred to this as a Duplette, and from his reconstruction, determined that the original OG had only  $\epsilon\nu \tau\eta \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota$  in the first instance and only  $\epsilon\kappa \mu\epsilon\rho\upsilon\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  in the second.

If we examine the two Greek versions at hand, we see, first of all, that B, by replacing  $\epsilon\kappa \mu\epsilon\rho\upsilon\varsigma$  with  $\epsilon\kappa \pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$  in the first instance but not in the second, attests that it corrected according to a Hebrew text already like that of MT, changing the text only where the Hebrew was extant, and further, that  $\epsilon\kappa \mu\epsilon\rho\upsilon\varsigma$  was indeed the original OG. From the viewpoint of the meaning of the phrase,  $\mu\epsilon\rho\varsigma$  makes far less sense here as a translation of  $\gamma\zeta$  than does  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\rho\alpha$ , and it is highly unlikely that cod B, here the kaigé recension, would have substituted a less correct and precise Greek word for one that was already correct. However, the

<sup>234</sup> Schulz II, p. 158.

<sup>235</sup> Wellhausen, pp. 222 f.

fact that  $\alpha\mu\mu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  appears here in Ant as well as at the end of the verse seems, against Wellhausen, to be a sign not only that it was present in OG, but also that OG's Vorlage must have contained  $\text{מִצֵּר הָהָר}$  here. That  $\text{בְּמִוִּיר}$ , giving rise to  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\eta\ \alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota$ , may also have been in the Vorlage is another question (see below), but if  $\alpha\mu\mu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  had not already been there, kaigé would have had nothing to correct here, and if  $\text{מִצֵּר הָהָר}$  had not been in OG's Vorlage, there is no reason why OG would have included the phrase.

If this is true, however, it may well be that OG did include a Duplette here after all. Wellhausen posited the presence of  $\text{בְּמִוִּיר}$  on the strength of  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\eta\ \alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota$  and on an analogy with  $\text{בֵּית-חִוּרִן}$  found at Josh 10:11. The validity of this line of reasoning lies in the presumption that  $\text{אַחֲרָיו}$  is corrupt, and that OG has transmitted the true original form  $\text{חֲרָיו}$ . In addition to the fact that  $\text{חֵרֶן}$  is never without the  $\text{בֵּית}$ , and that no dual form for this locality is attested elsewhere,<sup>236</sup> there remains to be explained how the textual accident could have taken place. In order to end up with Wellhausen's text, one must posit a haplography, then the transformation of  $\text{חֲרָיו}$  to  $\text{אַחֲרָיו}$ , then, for OG, a double translation of  $\text{בְּמִוִּיר}$  as  $\alpha\mu\mu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\eta\ \alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota$ . The first of these is, of course, a possibility, but no sufficient explanation has ever been given as to how  $\text{חֲרָיו}$  could have become  $\text{אַחֲרָיו}$ . If, on the other hand, we posit a misreading of  $\text{אַחֲרָיו}$  on OG's part, either accidentally or because it found that a place name seemed to be required here and looked for one that resembled the consonantal text, the  $\text{ῶραναμ}$  of OG becomes understandable. Where similar names occur, both at Josh 10:10 f. and Jer 48:5 (LXX 31:5), the further designation of  $\text{בְּמִוִּיר}$  is present, which could have inspired LXX to insert it here as well. At Josh 10:11, for MT  $\text{בֵּית-חִוּרִן}$  LXX reads  $\epsilon\mu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \text{ῶραναμ}$ ,

236 Driver, p. 304.



while for Jer 48:5 בְּמִדְבַּר חֲרֹנַיִם, LXX reads ἐν ὁδοῦ Ῥωρωναίου.<sup>237</sup> That בְּמִדְבַּר or ἐν τῇ ἀταβασσεῖ could have been an explanatory addition in 2 Sam 13:24 is shown also by its position. In every other instance of this term, always with a place name, it precedes the name (Josh 10:11; Judg 1:16 [LXX]; Jer 48:5; 1 Macc 3:24). That it should come after it in 13:24 may be a sign that it was purposely added later as a further designation of the supposed Horonaim. The result of such an addition in OG, however, is to overload the phrase with place designations (τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ Ῥωρωναίου ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦ ὁρους ἐν τῇ ἀταβασσεῖ), which hardly seems called for in the middle of a lively narrative such as in chapter 13.

The place known as חֲרֹנַיִם, according to Isa 15:5 and Jer 48:3.5.34, was in Transjordan, probably southeast of the Dead Sea.<sup>238</sup> As such, it would seem excluded as being the place from which David's sons were coming in 13:34. Beth-Horon, the site which most commentators seem to agree on for 13:34, lay northwest of Jerusalem.<sup>239</sup> Isaiah and Jeremiah refer to the בְּמִדְבַּר חֲרֹנַיִם and דְּרֹךְ חֲרֹנַיִם, respectively, but if Horonaim was southeast of the Dead Sea, travelers on such a road would hardly be coming from Beth Horon in the north, and, further, it seems highly unlikely that two roads, coming from nearly opposite directions, would have the same name. Therefore, מִדְבַּר חֲרֹנַיִם, as a correction in 13:34, is not very likely.

J. Simons rejected the emendation of אַחֲרָיו, claiming that MT makes sufficiently good sense here: "Naturally the royal princes had fled from Baal-Hazor into the

237 But ἐν τῇ ἀταβασσεῖ Ῥωρωναίου in mss 51-62-311-407-449-Syhm<sup>8</sup>, all of which contain Lucianic readings according to J. Ziegler, Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae (Göttingen, 1957), p. 79.

238 J. Simons, The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament (Leiden, 1959), p. 436. Cf. also F.-M. Abel, Géographie de la Palestine. T. II (Paris, 1938), p. 350.

239 Driver, p. 304.

desert of Ephraim and therefore made their way towards Jerushalaim by a roundabout way (cp. v.30). The watcher looking northward and standing on the traditional post of observation ... only saw them when, for a moment, he glanced around or behind."<sup>240</sup>

Although mention of the watchman is not specifically made by Josephus, he may provide a veiled reference to אחריז in his version of the scene: "Meanwhile the clatter of horses and the noise of approaching men caused them to look around," as if the tumult came from behind them."<sup>241</sup>

If מורר אחריז is accepted as the genuine reading here, it is more difficult to see how a haplography in the text could have given rise to MT. Most correctors suggest that cod B שם וז עב represents as original מורר, and the haplography occurred from מורר to מורר. If this were the case, however, it would have been much more likely that מורר and not מורר should have fallen out of the text. Further, while הלכים מורר אחריז is grammatically satisfactory, even if somewhat awkward, the reconstructed form, ראיתי אנשים מורר is harsh, as Smith pointed out, and could make one suspect that an insertion, based on the shorter MT, had been forced into the text.

It is not necessary for the narrative that the watchman actually express his message to David. 1 Sam 14:16 f. shows that in the narrative style of Sam, it is sufficient that the watchman see something, while the report to the interested party is understood from the context. LXX or its Vorlage may not have been satisfied with this technique here at 2 Sam 13:34, and filled in what it considered to be a lacuna in the text. If this is the case here, then the text has been augmented in such a way that the longer LXX appears to be "haplogenic" because of the repetition of the

240 Simons, Geographical and Topographical Texts, p. 334.

241 Μεταξυ δε ατατος απωσ και θορυβος προσιοιτων τινων αυτους επεστρεψεν, Ant. VII, 179. Josephus makes no mention of Horonaim here.

place name which the LXX text used in order to make its insertion here.

## 2 Sam 14:30

MT: וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל-עַבְדָּיו רְאוּ חֵלֶק יוֹאָב אֶל-יָדָיו וְלוֹ-שָׁשׁ עַרְיִים לֹכֹ וְהוֹצִתָּהּ בָּשָׁ וַיִּצְחָו עַבְדֵי אֲבִשָׁלוֹם תַּח-הַחֵלֶק בָּשָׁ

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ειπεν προς τους παιδας αυτου Αβεσσαλωμ Ιδετε η μερις εν αγρω του Ιωαβ εχομενα μου, και αυτω κριθαι εκει· πορευεσθε και εμπρησατε αυτην εν πυρι· και ενεπρησαν αυτας οι παιδες Αβεσσαλωμ, την μεριδα. και παραγινονται οι δουλοι Ιωαβ προς αυτον διερρηχότες τα ιματια αυτων και ειπαν Ενεπυρισαν οι δουλοι Αβεσσαλωμ την μεριδα εν πυρι.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ειπεν Αβεσσαλωμ προς τους δουλους αυτου Ιδετε, η μερις η εχομενη ημων εν αγρω του Ιωαβ, και αυτω εκει κριθαι· πορευθητε δη και ιδετε, και εμπυρισατε αυτας εν πυρι. και ενεπυρισαν αυτας οι δουλοι Αβεσσαλωμ εν πυρι, την μεριδα Ιωαβ. και παραγινονται δουλοι Ιωαβ προς αυτον διερρηχότες τα ιματια αυτων και λεγουσιν Ενεπυρισαν οι δουλοι Αβεσσαλωμ την μεριδα εν πυρι.

4QSam<sup>c</sup>:<sup>242</sup> (sic) וַיֹּאמֶר עַל עַבְדֵי [וְ] רְאוּ חֵלֶק יוֹאָב עַל [יָדָיו] לֹכֹ וְשָׁשׁ עַרְיִים [לֹכֹ] וְהוֹצִתָּהּ בָּשָׁ וַיִּצְחָו עַבְדֵי אֲבִשָׁלוֹם [תַּח-הַחֵלֶק בָּשָׁ] וְיִבְנוּ [יָדָיו] וְיֹאב אֶלֹ כְּרֹעֵי בְּגָדֵיהֶם וַיֹּאמְרוּ הִצִּיתָו [עַבְדֵי] אֲבִשָׁלוֹם תַּח-הַחֵלֶק בָּשָׁ

In this verse which describes Absalom's plan for getting Joab to come to him by having his field set on fire, LXX contains a plus which describes the reaction of Joab's servants: "And the servants of Joab, having rent their garments, came to him and said, 'The servants of Absalom have set the field on fire'." The plus is found in the text of OL<sup>243</sup> and 4 QSam<sup>c</sup> as well.

Houbigant accepted the originality of the plus, blaming its absence in MT on a combination of homeoarcton

242 Ulrich, "4QSam<sup>c</sup>: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14-15 from the Scribe of the Serek Hay-yahad (IQS):" BASOR 235 (1979), p. 170.

243 OL<sup>V</sup>: Et venerunt servi Joab ad dominum suum scissis vestimentis, et dixerunt ei: Succenderunt servi Absalom partem agri cum hordeo in igne. OLS: Et venientes servi Joab, scissis vestimentis suis, dixerunt: Succenderunt servi Absalom partem agri igni.

and homeoteleuton.<sup>244</sup> A certain number of commentators have followed suit in accepting the plus,<sup>245</sup> and Thenius blamed its absence on the repetition of אהלהלך.<sup>246</sup>

Wellhausen rejected the plus because, "for Hebrew readers, verse 31 did not need a long introduction," and further, "Joab would not have been able to make any sense out of the simple την μεριδα, and διεσπρηχότες τα ιματια αυτων appears to be a forced recollection."<sup>247</sup> His rejection of the plus is in accord with the majority of authors and translations.<sup>248</sup>

The information contained in the plus here is not necessary for the narrative and, as frequently occurs, MT appears to have left up to the reader to realize that Joab was informed of the attack on his field, while LXX's text seems to have spelled it out here.

The fact that Joab's servants rend their garments seems oddly out of place here. The act of rending one's garments, with the verb קרע, while it occurs forty-one times in the Bible, is ordinarily a sign of grief (e.g. 2 Sam 13:31), fear (e.g. 1 Sam 4:12), desperation (2 Kgs 5:8), or abasement (Joel 2:3). The only other instance where anger seems to be connected with rending garments (as appears to be the case in our verse here) is found at 2 Kgs 11:14 (= 2 Chr 23:13), where Athaliah rends her garments upon seeing Joash crowned king in the temple. The incident of Joab's field is hardly comparable, and the servants' reaction is overly dramatic over against the more sober MT account. This fact,

244 "... initium habebant [codices] in verbo ויבאו, et ven-  
erunt, ut versus sequens in ויבא, et venit [sic];  
finem vero in vocabulo באש" (Houbigant, p. 343).

245 Thenius, Böttcher, Klostermann, Ewald, Peters, Dhorme, Ulrich, NAB. Smith is undecided, but leans toward acceptance.

246 Thenius<sup>2</sup>, p. 215.

247 Wellhausen, p. 194.

248 Vercellone, Keil, Erdmann, Driver, Nowack, Graetz, Hummelauer, Budde, Löhr, Kittel, Ehrlich, Schulz, Hertzberg, Barthélemy, BHS, RSV, NEB, BJ, TOB, Eü.

plus LXX's penchant for filling in where MT leaves actions unsaid and up to the reader to understand, makes it advisable to accept the shorter MT as original here.

As may be seen above, the Greek texts of cod B and Ant differ from one another in many respects, and a close examination is necessary in order to determine the text of OG. The differences are found both in the word order and the vocabulary used:

B- προς τους παιδας αυτου Αβεσσαλωμ	Ant- Αβεσσαλωμ προς τους δουλους αυτου
εν αγρω του Ιωαβ εχομενα μου	η εχομενη ημων εν αγρω του Ιωαβ
κριθαι εκει	εκει κριθαι
πορευεσθε	πορευθητε δη και ιδετε
την μεριδα 1°	εν πυρι την μεριδα Ιωαβ
εμπρησατε αυτην	εμπυρισατε αυτας
ενεπρησαν	ενεπυρισαν
παιδες	δουλοι
ειπαν	λεγουσιν

The only divergence in the 'plus' section occurs between ειπαν and λεγουσιν, while all the rest are in the first part of the verse. The uniform use of δουλοι and εμπυριζειν in Ant over against παιδες and εμπρηθειν in B for the section outside the plus, compared with the conformity of B with Ant in the plus, indicates that B took over the plus as it found it, but modified its text somewhat where it possessed a Hebrew base. Αυτην in B for αυτας 1° in Ant shows that the latter took κριθαι as its antecedent while B took η μερις. Thus, B here is closer to MT (and to 4QSam<sup>C</sup>). Ant πορευθητε δη και ιδετε for B πορευεσθε shows B once again closer to MT. Note that the extra words in Ant are also absent from 4QSam<sup>C</sup>. In the sentence και ενεπρησαν αυτας οι παιδες Αβεσσαλωμ την μεριδα (B), where Ant has και ενεπυρισαν αυτας οι δουλοι Αβεσσαλωμ εν πυρι

την μεριδα Ιωαβ, both texts contain αυτας as well as την μεριδα as the object of the burning. The pronominal object, since it diverges from MT, is probably original OG, and B, in its modification toward MT retained the OG reading as well. It is hard to see how OG could have originally had two objects of ενεκυρισαν, and therefore, την μεριδα Ιωαβ in Ant is probably a later addition to the text. <sup>4</sup>QSam<sup>C</sup>, with B and MT, but against Ant, lacks Ιωαβ here, and, with MT but against B and Ant lacks αυτας.

The original Greek text, therefore, may be taken to be that of Ant, minus the phrase την μεριδα Ιωαβ which was a later, clarifying addition. If this is so, then a presumed accident through homeoteleuton cannot really explain the shorter MT form, as a comparison of the final clause of MT indicates;

MT: שָׂא בָּא הָרִיחַה-הָא אֶת־שִׂמְשֹׁם וְיָצְחוּ יָדָיו

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ενεκυρησαν αυτας οι παιδες Αβεσσαλωμ την μεριδα

Ant: και ενεκυρησαν αυτας οι δουλοι Αβεσσαλωμ εν πυρι  
(την μεριδα Ιωαβ)

Schulz maintained that the final εν πυρι of LXX (which is present in cod B), corresponds to MT שָׂא בָּא 2° and that the Greek plus had been inserted before שָׂא.<sup>249</sup> The presence of εν πυρι in Ant just before the plus, however, makes this seem unlikely. The form of Ant suggests rather that the addition in OG was made at the word יָצְחוּ, where OG inserted και ενεκυρισαν αυτας instead of repeating the original την μεριδα. The plus then ended with και λεγουσιν, at which point it was joined up with the original text, ενεκυρισαν οι δουλοι Αβεσσαλωμ την μεριδα εν πυρι, thus creating a text in OG which appeared to be "haplogenic" in form because of the repetition of ενεκυρισαν.

<sup>4</sup>QSam<sup>C</sup> here, while it contains the plus of LXX, presents one unusual variant in יוֹאֵב יָדָיו [יְיָ יוֹאֵב]. The

---

<sup>249</sup> Schulz II, p. 174.

Greek text here reads δούλοι<sup>250</sup> although nowhere else in the Bible does לָבִי lie at the base of δούλος in Greek. Παις translates לָבִי at 2 Kgs 2:24 and Qoh 4:13 only -- and neither of these has the meaning of "servant" in the context. The usual translation for לָבִי is παιδίον (thirty-six times) or παιδάριον (thirty-four times).<sup>251</sup> Barthélemy suggests, for 4QSam<sup>c</sup> here, "n'y aurait-il pas là la retroversion maladroite d'un παιδες?"<sup>252</sup> which opens the possibility of a text at Qumran which was edited from the Greek. It would be extremely difficult otherwise to account for לָבִי here, since it does not correspond to Hebrew usage, nor would παιδες in Greek, in the context of this verse, have suggested anything other than עַבְדִּי, even for someone who knew only a minimum of Hebrew.

Summing up this case, therefore, we see that LXX or its Vorlage has inserted a plus designed to show the reaction of Joab's servants to the burning of his field, and to make the report of the event to Joab, while MT's shorter text left this up to the reader. The plus has been inserted in such a way that it has created a text in which the repetition of one word at the beginning and end of the insertion has led some to blame its absence from MT on a textual accident due to homeoteleuton, whereas it is the shorter text of MT which is the more original here.

## 2 Sam 15:20b

MT: שׁוּב וְהָיָה לְךָ כַּעֲבָדִי וְלֹא תִהְיֶה לְךָ מַלְאָכָה

LXX<sup>B</sup>: επιστρεφου και επιστρεφον τους αδελφους σου μετα σου, και Κυριος ποιησει μετα σου ελεος και αληθειαν.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και αναστρεφε, και αποστρεφε τους αδελφους σου μετα σου, και Κυριος ποιησει μετα σου ελεον και αληθειαν.

250 Παιδες in mss c x only.

251 Followed by τεκνον (10 times), υιος (3 times), αρσην (twice), νεανιας and νεωτερος (once each).

252 Barthélemy, CTAT.

The final words of 2 Sam 15:20 contain a plus in LXX vis-à-vis MT in which, after David recalls Itthai's arrival among his troops and counsels him to return and take his brethren with him, LXX contains the words "and may the Lord show you" before the final "steadfast and kindness." Already Houbigant pointed out the "mutilus contextus" here in this final phrase, which seems to go against the ordinary usage of  $\text{מָלַךְ וְיָהוָה}$  in such a context. LXX's  $\text{καὶ Κύριος ποιησάι μετὰ σου ἐλεος καὶ ἀληθείαν}$  provides what seems to be lacking in MT, and Houbigant reconstructed  $\text{וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה עִמָּךְ}$ , blaming the omission on an error of haplography resulting from homeoteleuton at  $\text{עִמָּךְ}$ .

The plus is recorded in OL<sup>s</sup> as well, reading et Dominus faciat tecum misericordiam et veritatem. The text of Vg shows a slight variant here, for a great number of mss<sup>254</sup> read revertere et reduc tecum fratres tuos, et Dominus faciet tecum misericordiam et veritatem, quia ostendisti gratiam et fidem.<sup>255</sup> The middle section here appears to be an insertion of the OL text, with quia an addition to make the transition smoother to ostendisti gratiam et fidem. The text of Tg  $\text{חֲנוּךְ וְאֵתִיב יְיָ אִתְּךָ עִמָּךְ וְעִבְדִּי עִמָּךְ}$ , witnesses to the plus as well, although without the  $\text{יְהוָה}$  of LXX, and Tg's  $\text{וְעִבְדִּי}$  may account here for Jerome's translation. Syr, on the other hand, seems to contain a paraphrase of MT:  $\text{pwš w'wtb 'lhyk špyr}$ .

Keil has maintained translating it as "mit dir sei Gnade und Wahrheit,"<sup>256</sup> followed by Erdmann, who objects to the longer LXX form as giving the impression of a paraphrase

253 Houbigant, p. 317, followed by Thenius, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Driver, Budde, Smith, Nowack, Löhr, Peters, Kittel, Böttcher, Schulz, Hertzberg, HOTTP, RSV, NEB, NAB, BJ, Osty, Eu.

254 All except RACD<sup>ψ</sup><sub>D</sub> RZG.

255 Which contains both Vg and OL. Cf. Vercellone, p. 385: "Geminam unius hemistichii interpretationem exhibent."

256 Keil, p. 304.



based on the similar words in 2 Sam 2:6.<sup>257</sup> Driver, however, noted that this shorter text does not take into account the disjunctive accent ṭiphā with וְעַתָּה and passes over the fact that וְעַתָּה seems to require וְעַתָּה to complete its sense.<sup>258</sup>

There is good evidence for this expression, as 2 Sam 2:6 shows: וְעַתָּה יְעֹשֶׂה-יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם חֶסֶד וְאֱמֻנָה. There is, of course, the possibility that LXX had been inspired by the previous use in order to expand the text at 15:20, but the grammatical harshness in MT's shorter text is a telling sign that something has fallen out. Since the plus consists of only three words, and not a long passage such as is found in many of the other LXX pluses, the chances of its having been accidentally omitted from MT are greatly increased.

This LXX plus here, therefore, seems to be a genuine example of a text fallen out of MT through haplography. The presence of a form of the plus in Vg and Tg as well indicates that these versions found fault with MT.

### Conclusions

In the preceding pages we have examined nineteen cases<sup>259</sup> in which the text of LXX presents a significant plus for which it has been suggested that the absence from MT is due to an accident through homeoteleuton or homeoarcton. In one case only, 2 Sam 15:20b, it seems absolutely certain that an accident due to homeoteleuton has taken place in MT, and LXX may be used to restore the text. In two other cases, 2 Sam 13:21.27, it is highly probable that accidents have occurred and that LXX must be considered original, although the fact that the pluses here appear to be tacked on to their respective verses, and that each is reminiscent of a text found elsewhere in Sam or Kgs, may point to the artificiality of the plus. In one other case, it seems impossible to decide

---

257 Erdmann, p. 465.

258 Driver, p. 314.

259 To the eighteen cases examined in this section must be added 1 Sam 3:21 (see pp. 30f.).

whether the plus is original or not (1 Sam 29:10). In each of the other cases, we have tried to show that it may be said, with varying degrees of certitude, that the pluses represent additions to a shorter text like that of MT.

In order to understand these pluses which are additions to the text, the characteristics which are present in the pluses examined in Part 1.1 must be recalled. We saw that many of them indicate a literary creativity on the part of the text witnessed to in LXX, and that it is possible, at least in a broad way, to group the pluses into different categories in order to show what the editors' interests were in making these insertions. An examination of these pluses which appear to be "haplogenic" in form shows that many of them fall into these same general categories.

#### 1. Completing the "unsaid".

Under this heading may be included pluses such as 1 Sam 3:15, which specifies that Samuel "got up in the morning", showing LXX's desire to leave nothing unsaid in the narrative, whereas MT's shorter text passes directly from "Samuel lay down until morning" to "and he opened the doors..." At 1 Sam 10:21, where MT's more rapid narrative has left understood one of the steps in the lot-casting which designated Saul as king, LXX saw it necessary to include it in its text. Again at 1 Sam 13:5, the LXX text specifies that "they went up against Israel", even though this was clear from the context. At 1 Sam 23:6, LXX spells out the fact that Abiathar went with David, apparently in order to clarify an early corruption in the text which MT still contains. In 2 Sam 13:34, the LXX makes the sentinel deliver his message to David, which MT had left understood. Finally, at 2 Sam 14:30, LXX again spells out the delivery of news, in addition to dramatizing the event by having Joab's men rend their garments.

#### 2. Changing the point of view.

We saw that in 1 Sam 1 a whole series of LXX additions served to change the character of this chapter by emphasizing, among other things, Elkanah's rôle in the

proceedings. At 1:24, a further plus, this time in a form which is "haplogenic", continues this same perspective by specifying Elkanah as the one who offered the sacrifice while in MT the subject is "they" (Elkanah and Hannah together). The long pluses at 1 Sam 14:41 and 42 also add information which changes the character of the narrative here. The MT does not seem to have taken a great interest in the lot-casting procedure here whereas LXX's addition of the Urim and Tummim in 14:41 bring the text to emphasize the aspect significantly. As we discussed above, however, this is one of the cases in which it is difficult to arrive at absolute certainty as to whether the plus is original or not. In 14:42, the plus serves to change the point of view as well, showing the people's disagreement with the process, an attitude which is not specified in MT until v.45.

### 3. Added emphasis to the text.

A number of texts contain additions which serve to add emphasis to the narrative. At 1 Sam 3:21 the text found in LXX has added the comment on the evil ways of Eli's sons, which serves to emphasize the contrast once again in this chapter between them and Samuel's stature as a prophet of the Lord.<sup>260</sup> At 1 Sam 10:1, LXX's text emphasizes Saul's rôle as saving leader of the people and introduces the signs which will indicate this rôle. At 1 Sam 12:8, a small plus emphasizes the oppression of the Israelites at the hands of the Egyptians, apparently inspired by Josh 24:4, within Samuel's catalogue of the Lord's saving deeds. Finally, at 1 Sam 30:24, LXX's text has David emphasize the importance of the two hundred men who stayed behind by the brook of Beser.

Outside of these three categories in which similar kinds of additions are found in both the "haplogenic" and the "non-haplogenic" forms of the pluses, two other significant

---

<sup>260</sup> As we saw in the discussion of this verse, the "haplogenic" form of the addition is not found in the actual Greek text but in the reconstruction proposed by Thenius and McCarter.

pluses occur in 1 Sam, at 13:15 and 15:12 f. As we saw in the examination of the texts, 15:12 f. has a "haplogenic" form which would have given rise to MT's shorter text only in Ant. The plus registered in Greek, however, appears to be an insertion intended to harmonize its surroundings with 13:7b-15a, Saul's offering of the sacrifices. The plus at 13:15 appears likewise to be a harmonization, where LXX's text has sought to alleviate the apparent anomaly of Samuel's departure for Gibeath-Benjamin. Although admittedly there is a lesser degree of certitude here that the plus is an insertion and not a genuinely accidental omission, it cannot be denied that this type of facilitating plus has been clearly shown to be typical enough of LXX's text so as to make it highly probable that it is an insertion here as well.

Thus, in the overwhelming majority of cases, the plus that exists in the Greek text appears to be the result of a deliberate insertion, even though the form of the plus suggests that it may have fallen out of MT through haplography.<sup>261</sup> If the analysis of the genuineness of MT for the above texts is accurate, and the pluses are later insertions, then the conclusion suggests itself that these insertions have been made in the apparent form which we call "haplogenic." That is to say that the editor who wished to expand his text took advantage of one word in the verse around which he made his insertion, and concluded the insertion with the same word, leaving in his wake a text which appears to have given rise to a textual accident in MT's shorter text, but which in reality is simply the result of an expansion. The frequency of these pluses whose originality is suspect indicates that we must find some way of accounting for their presence in the text. The hypothesis that an editor

---

261 It is significant that, although in most of these cases the majority of commentators has accepted the longer LXX reading, two of the most recent studies of Samuel (Stoebe and HOTTP) have opted frequently for the shorter MT reading. Among the modern translations, RSV and TOB have likewise followed MT for a majority of these cases.

purposely took a specific word as his point of departure, and ended his insertion with the same word, seems to account for this phenomenon.

In two of the texts, 1 Sam 1:24 and 29:10, the form of MT shows that a genuine haplography could not have taken place. In each of these cases, an editor seems to have used a repetition that was already in the text (1:24 חנער נער: 29:10 והשכחם...השכם) in order to make his insertion. In the other cases, the repetition occurs only in the longer text of LXX. It is significant, as well, that the only case in which the grammar of the text of MT was significantly disturbed is 2 Sam 15:20b, where LXX's plus seems clearly original and at the same time rectifies the disturbed grammar. In the other cases, if the existence of the plus had not been known through LXX, its absence would not have been noticed.

It is highly possible, therefore, that the technique employed in order to make these insertions which witness to the literary creativity of later editors was that of choosing a word around which the insertion was made and ending the insertion with that same word, thus producing an expansion which fitted more smoothly into the text. It is difficult to determine whether this may have taken place on the level of the LXX translation or already in its Vorlage. Further, it is not possible to say with absolute certainty that this was indeed the procedure used in these cases, but rather that this explanation appears to fit the circumstances in those cases where it seems certain that LXX witnesses to an expanded text.

## 2.2 "Haplogenic" pluses in MT

These pluses are "haplogenic" in form in MT, so that their absence from LXX suggests an error in the Greek text due to homeoteleuton or homeoarcton.

### 1 Sam 2:31 f.

MT: הנה ימים באים וגדעתי את-זרעך ואת-זרע בית אניך מהיות  
זקן בביתך<sup>32</sup> והבטת צר מעון בכל אשר-יטיב את-ישראל ולא-  
יהיה זקן בביתך כל-הימים

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>31</sup>ιδου ημεραι ερχονται και εξολεθρευσω το σπερμα σου  
και το σπερμα οικου πατρος σου. <sup>32</sup>και ουκ εσται σου  
πρεσβυτης εν οικω μου πασας τας ημερας.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: <sup>31</sup>και ιδου ημεραι ερχονται και εξολεθρευσω το σπερμα  
σου και το σπερμα του οικου του πατρος σου. <sup>32</sup>και  
επιβλεψει κραταιωμα ναων (νωων-b; ων-o; λαων-c<sub>2</sub>;  
μαων-e<sub>2</sub>) εν πασιν οis αγαθυνει τον Ισραηλ και ουκ  
εσται πρεσβυτης εν τω οικω σου πασας τας ημερας  
[+και ουκ εσται σοι πρεσβυτης εν τω οικω μου πασας  
τας ημερας<sup>1</sup>].

LXX<sup>Acx</sup>: <sup>31</sup>ιδου ημεραι ερχονται και εξολεθρευσω το σπερμα σου  
και το σπερμα οικου πατρος σου. και ουκ εσται σου  
πρεσβυτης εκ οικω μου. <sup>32</sup>και επιβλεψει κραταιωμα  
(+ μουων-A) εν πασιν οis αγαθυνει τον Ισραηλ και ουκ  
εσται πρεσβυτης εν (+ τω-A) οικω σου πασας τας ημερας.

4QSam<sup>a2</sup>: [הנה ימים וגדעתי את זרעך ואת]  
[זרע בית אניך ולוא] יהיה לך זקן בביתי כול [הימים]

In the middle of the prophecy against Eli's house, MT contains a large plus (ביתך זקן והבטת צר מעון בכל), reproduced in Ant and Acx but lacking in cod B and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. Thenius maintained that the plus accidentally fell out of the Greek through the similarity

1 Lagarde does not include this clause in his edition, but it is present in the mss b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>.

2 Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 59.

between *וּלֹא-יִהְיֶה זָקֵן בְּנִיתָן* and *מֵהֵיּוֹת זָקֵן בְּנִיתָן*, although one factor speaking against such an explanation is that if such an accident had occurred, it would ordinarily be the material preceding the second member of the repetition which would fall out. Here, however, the Greek *οὐκ ἔστιν* appears to translate *וּלֹא-יִהְיֶה* rather than *מֵהֵיּוֹת*. In no other occurrence of *מֵהֵיּוֹת* (Ex 9:28; 12:4; Lev 26:13; 1 Sam 15:26; 1 Kgs 2:27; Jer 31:36; 33:21.24; Ruth 1:12; Dan 12:1) does LXX use a finite form of *εἶναι*.

Wellhausen devoted a long discussion to this case, for which he decided that *וּלֹא-יִהְיֶה זָקֵן בְּנִיתָן* and *מֵהֵיּוֹת זָקֵן בְּנִיתָן* are variants of the same reading, which is itself a gloss, and that the MT plus at v.32a is to be eliminated since it occurs between two glosses and since it is lacking in LXX.<sup>4</sup> The glosses of vv.31b and 32b were due, according to Wellhausen, to an incorrect application of v.31a ("Behold the days are coming when I will cut off your 'arm' and the 'arm' of your father's house") to the death of Hophni and Phineas in chapter four, whereas it was originally intended to be a prophecy against Eli's house which would have its fulfillment in the massacre of the priests of Nob (1 Sam 22:17-20) and the banishment of Abiathar by Solomon (1 Kgs 2:27, where it is expressly said that the prophecy against Eli's house was fulfilled). MT v.32a presumes, still according to Wellhausen, that Eli witnesses the disaster prophesied for his house while v.34 (in both MT and LXX) indicates that the death of his sons is only the sign of the later disaster which, of course, Eli does not live to see.<sup>5</sup> He goes on to suggest that v.32a equals v.29a (which is itself obscure), and might be used to emend the latter, although he stated that he did not succeed in doing so.<sup>6</sup>

3 Followed by Klostermann, Hummelauer, Smith and Fernandez.

4 Wellhausen, pp. 48-51.

5 Driver, Nowack, Cross and McCarter have adopted Wellhausen's position here.

6 "Leider gelingt es mir nicht, dieses Recht practisch zu verwerthen, obwohl es klar ist, dass der MT v.29 verbesserungsbedürftig ist" (Wellhausen, p. 49).

The majority of commentators and all modern translations have preserved the longer MT reading here, in spite of the obscurity of v.32a.<sup>7</sup>

H. Seebass has proposed a rather thoroughgoing emendation of the text, but still basically follows the longer MT form. For vv.31 f. he reads: מהיות זקן בביתי והבט צר מעון כל אשר חטאתם אל קדשי ולא יהיה זקה בביתך כל המים לכלות את עוניך ולאדיב את נפשו ואיש לא אכרית.<sup>8</sup> This emendation is based, on the one hand, on an observation by Press<sup>9</sup> that the parallel to 2:27 ff. is 3:13, as in both places the culpability is that of Eli's sons whereas in 2:13-16 Eli himself appears to be guilty of misconduct with the sacrifices. This guilt of Eli's is found in 2:27-31.33 as well, which indicates that 3:12-14 is a secondary development based on the tendency in 2:27 ff. to exculpate Eli by placing the blame on his sons. On the other hand, this emendation is based on a number of corruptions and accidents which supposedly took place within the text. It is difficult to believe, however, that Seebass' text could have come about by the circuitous route which he suggests. For example, for MT's ככל אשר-יטיב את-ישראל as a corruption of an original כל אשר חטאתם אל קדשי, he is forced to posit a dittography and letter confusion at כל which produced ככל, a mistakenly placed beth plus heth misread as double yod, plus a mem misread as beth resulting in יטיב את חטאתם. Then, after this corruption had taken place, אל was relocated because of the erroneous את, qoph fell out through haplography, and the remaining ישר דשי became ישר through a reversal of letters and an erroneous resh for daleth, to change ישר אל קדשי into ישראל!<sup>10</sup>

7 Keil, Erdmann, Thenius, Klostermann, Hummelauer, Graetz, Smith, Budde, Dhorme, Fernandez, Ehrlich, Kittel, Schulz, Stoebe, Hertzberg, RSV, NEB, NAB, BJ, Osty, TOB, Eü, HOTTP, BHS.

8 H. Seebass, "Zum Text von 1 Sam XIV, 23B-25A und II, 29, 31-33," VT 16 (1956) 76-82.

9 R. Press, "Der Prophet Samuel," ZAW 56 (1938), pp. 179 f.

10 Seebass, "Zum Text...", p. 77.



The absence of the plus, however, is not the only variant between MT and LXX (and 4Q). The entire Greek tradition has understood זרע as זֶרַע (σπέρμα), while the MT as read זֶרַע - "arm, strength" - here. Further, αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἔσονται σοὶ<sup>11</sup> [ולוא] יהיה לך זקן (which agrees with 4Q זקן יהיה לך זקן) is at variance with MT בביתך. As the prophecy stands in MT, it is a condemnation of Eli's house (בביתך), while in LXX and 4Q it states that Eli's descendants will no longer be in the Lord's house (בביתי). These variants, coupled with the repetition of מהות זקן בביתך and לוא-יהיה זקן and בביתך in MT, suggest two possible explanations for the different forms. At one time there may have been two separate traditions, one witnessed by MT vv.31b-32a which placed the emphasis on the prophecy against Eli and his sons and which found its fulfillment in the death of Hophni and Phineas. The other, witnessed by LXX and 4Q, placed the emphasis on the extinction of the priesthood in Eli's family. This would account for the Lord's word that Eli's descendants would no longer be in his house, and would have found its fulfillment in the massacre of the priests of Nob and in Abiathar's banishment by Solomon. LXX and 4Q carried only the second of these, while proto-MT the first. Then at some time, MT incorporated the second into its text, although because of the similarity of the two, לך was dropped from the text and בביתי became modified to בביתך because of the similar form in v.31.

Another possibility is that the original prophecy was that of MT, specifically against Eli and the continuation of his descendants, but then, in order to join this passage to the passage of the priesthood from Eli's house, it was modified to the LXX form.

The second of these seems more probable since with it the original prophecy would have been addressed against Eli and his sons specifically. Because of the juxtaposition of the Elide downfall with young Samuel's growth in stature within the entire section 2:12-36, it is hard to avoid the

<sup>11</sup> Sic in all mss, although it is probably an early corruption of σοι.

conclusion that, at least at one time in the narrative, the "faithful priest" of v.35 was intended to mean Samuel.<sup>12</sup> The fact that the LXX and 4Q form shifts the emphasis away from the punishment of Eli's house through the death of Hophni and Phineas to the extinction of the Elide priesthood<sup>13</sup> with the concomitant rise of Zadok's star may be the indication that a later harmonization was worked into the text. It is, moreover, more natural to expect that a text should fit in to its own immediate context rather than that it should agree with some later material. Since a prophecy against Eli's house was already in the text here, it could easily have been modified in order to embrace the later historical events which included the slaughter of the priests at Nob and Abiathar's banishment.

The rest of the MT plus, והבט צר מעון בכל אשר-, is admittedly obscure, and the ancient versions witness to a variety of translations here: Et attendit fideliter manens in omnibus quibus benefacit Israel (OL<sup>V</sup>); Et videbis aemulum tuum in templo in universis prosperis Israel (Vg); και επιβλεψη αντιζηλον κατοικητηριου...(A'); και οφει θλιψιν κατοικησεως εν παντι ω ευεργετηθησεται Ισραηλ (Σ'); και επιβλεψη κραταιωμα Μων εν πασιν ος αγαθουει τον Ισραηλ (Θ')<sup>14</sup>; "And you will contemplate and will look on the distress which will be on the man of your house because of the sins which you have sinned against me in my sanctuary" (Tg); "and [there will be no one] who can hold a scepter in your dwelling nor anyone benevolent in Israel" (Syr).

The thorny צר מעון in v.32, along with צוית מעון of v.29, have been the object of a number of suggested

12 Cf. Hertzberg, pp. 44 f.

13 Note also, in 1 Sam 2:33, the LXX variant τους οφθαλμούς αυτού...την ψυχην αυτού for MT נפשו...עיניו.

14 For the texts of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, cf. Field, Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt, I., p. 492.

corrections,<sup>15</sup> although nothing entirely satisfactory has yet been proposed and, as we saw, Wellhausen admitted failure in making sense out of the phrase.

If the meaning of the verse is not clear, however, it is risky to eliminate it simply for that reason. Since it appears to be addressed to Eli, it might, however, have been expunged from the text by a later editor who wished to shift the emphasis away from Eli. If so, because of the repetition of the other two almost identical phrases, it could have been removed without leaving a scar. As it stands, MT is the lectio difficilior, which, along with the fact that the text seems to have originally referred to Eli directly and not to the later Elide priesthood, is a sign that it is the most original reading here.

1 Sam 4:9

MT: וְהָיוּ לְאִנְשֵׁים פְּלִשְׁתִּים כִּן תַּעֲבֹדוּ לְעִבְרִים כְּאִשֶּׁר עֲבַדְתֶּם לָכֵן  
וְהָיִיתֶם לְאִנְשֵׁים וְנִלְחַמְתֶּם

LXX<sup>B</sup>: κραταιουσθε και γινεσθε εις ανδρας και πολεμησατε  
αυτους.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: κραταιουσθε και γινεσθε εις ανδρας, αλλοφυλοι, οπως  
μη δουλευσητε τοις Εβραιοις καθ'ως εδουλευσαν υμιν,  
και εσεσθε εις ανδρας, και πολεμησατε αυτους.

The absence of the central part of this verse from cod B (along with mss v y a<sub>2</sub>) seems clearly to be the result of an accident due to homeoteleuton here, a scribe's eye having passed from εις ανδρας 1° to 2°, or from לאנשים if it occurred already in LXX's Vorlage. Most commentators take no note of the absence in cod B, while Thenius, Peters, Dhorme,<sup>16</sup>

15 For צר מעין in v.32: צר ומעין (Houbigant); צריח עין (Thenius); מיצר ומעין (Klostermann, Smith); צר ומצוק (Graetz); עי מעין (Budde, Dhorme); צר עין (Schulz); צרה עין (Cross); "with envious eye" (RSV); "a disappointed rival" (NAB); "en ennemi jaloux" (BJ<sup>1</sup>); "à côté de la Demeure" (BJ<sup>3</sup>); "l'angoisse à demeure" (Dhorme 1956, Barthélemy, CTAT); "un rival dans la Demeure" (TOB); "Voll Neid" (Eü).

16 Dhorme, however, attributed the haplography to a passage from פלשתים to נלחמם without explaining why no trace of פלשתים persisted in cod B (p. 48).

Schulz and McCarter are in agreement on the textual accident in B. McCarter notes that the longer text of MT is found in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> as well.<sup>17</sup>

The Greek text appears to have completed the thought of the Hebrew by adding αυτοὺς to πολεμήσατε, while the majority of Greek mss have corrected their text according to MT as far as the plus is concerned.

It is possible that the missing words were purposely suppressed since they refer to the Hebrews' enslavement to the Philistines, the recollection of which might have been offensive to Israelite ears. If this were the case, then an editor would have profited from the repetition of εἰς ἀνδράς to make his excision without leaving a scar in the text. There is, however, no way of proving such an eventuality, and the material possibility of the accident through homeoteleuton makes it most probable that cod B, or the Vorlage of LXX has suffered a textual accident here.

#### 1 Sam 6:4

MT: ויאמר מה האשם אשר נשיב לו ויאמרו מספר סרני פלשתים חמשה  
עפלי זהב וחמשה עכברי זהב כי-מגפה אחת לכלם ולסרניכם

LXX<sup>B</sup>: καὶ λεγουσιν Τι το της βασανου αποδωσομεν αυτη; καὶ  
ειπαν Κατ'αριθμον των σατραπων των αλλοφυλων πεντε  
εδρας χρυσας, οτι πταισμα εν υμιν καὶ τοις αρχουσιν  
υμων εν τω λαω.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: καὶ λεγουσιν Τι το υπερ της βασανου ο αποδωσομεν  
αυτη; καὶ ειπον αυτοις εκεινοι Κατα αριθμον των  
σατραπειων των αλλοφυλων ποιησατε πεντε εδρας χρυσας  
ομοιωμα των εδρων υμων, οτι πταισμα εν υμιν καὶ τοις  
αρχουσιν υμων καὶ εν τω λαω.

4QSam<sup>a</sup>:<sup>18</sup> ]פלי זהב כי[

In MT here, there is a short plus which states that five golden mice, along with the five golden tumors, were part of the guilt offering to be presented to Yahweh by the Philistines for the plague visited upon them. This plus is

<sup>17</sup> McCarter, p. 104. Ulrich does not treat this verse in QTSJ.

<sup>18</sup> Ulrich, QTSJ, p. 63.

lacking in cod B (here OG),<sup>19</sup> and apparently in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> as well. Ant here has, in its place, a different reading altogether:  $\alpha\mu\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\omega\upsilon\ \epsilon\delta\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ . Although the plus is small, only three words, that could have accidentally fallen out of LXX or its Vorlage because of homeoteleuton at  $\nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ , most commentators discuss it in conjunction with the other variants between MT and LXX surrounding the tumors and mice in chapters five and six.

Houbigant, basing his reasoning on the mention of the golden mice "according to the number of all the cities of the Philistines belonging to the five lords" (6:18), would add, after  $\nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ,  $\nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ,<sup>20</sup> but has not been followed in this suggestion. Thenius, while recognizing the plus in LXX 5:3 (see below) as a misplaced addition from 5:6, accepts LXX 5:6 as original, but would make no change in MT 5:9 or 6:4.<sup>21</sup> Wellhausen did not depart from MT for any of these verses under question, but suggested that the mice were simply symbols of the pestilence and the misunderstanding of this symbolism led to the confusion in the text.<sup>22</sup> Smith criticized this line of argumentation, however. "There seems to be no Hebrew analogy to strengthen this supposition, and it seems pretty certain that if the earliest author of this account had known of the assumed symbolism he would have indicated it in some way."<sup>23</sup> Smith himself would eliminate all the references to mice,

19 The plus is present, however, in mss A N c d e h p q t v x z <236>

20 Houbigant, p. 292. He would also add, in 5:6, the LXX plus describing the presence of mice: "Nam credi vix potest, sacrum scriptorem qui non tacuit de ano Philistorum vulnerato, de muribus quos terra ebulliebat tacuisse" (p. 291).

21 Thenius<sup>2</sup>, pp. 22-25.

22 Wellhausen here cites Hitzig, Urgeschichte der Philister, p. 201.

23 Smith, p. 43.

wherever they occur in these two chapters,<sup>24</sup> and takes Budde to task for admitting the mice in 6:1 but eliminating them in 6:4. Budde based his decision on the hypothesis of two sources, one which held the tumors and the other the mice, as the guilt offering.<sup>25</sup>

Schulz concluded that originally there was one plague (the tumors) and one offering (the golden mice). At a later time, when the relation between the mice and the plague was misunderstood, the "tumor offering" was introduced into the text. Then, since the golden mice were no longer directly connected to the tumor plague, a "mouse plague" was introduced to correspond to the tumors.<sup>26</sup>

McCarter, rejecting Wellhausen's solution of considering the golden mice as symbols of the plague, accepts the LXX reference to the plague of mice in 5:6 as original,<sup>27</sup> and rejects the five golden mice of 6:4 on the grounds that they contradict v.18.<sup>28</sup> In the modern translations we find a variety of options. NEB and NAB include the plus of 5:6 but otherwise follow MT. BJ<sup>1</sup> reads as MT except for 6:4, where it translated. "cinq tumeurs d'or et des images de vos rats" (following LXX<sup>B</sup> more or less for vv.4-5 but changing the order of the sentences). RSV, Dhorme (1956), Osty, BJ<sup>3</sup>, TOB and Eü follow MT.

---

24 Smith concluded that "the mice, wherever they appear, are the result of late redactional insertion" (p. 41), but is precisely the fact that they appear to be contradictory to the rest of the narrative that argues against their later insertion.

25 Budde, KHAT, p. 40.

26 Schulz, p. 100. This opinion is followed by the most recent studies on the question. F. Schicklberger, Die Ladeerzählung des Ersten Samuel-Buches (Würzburg, 1973), p. 115; J.B. Geyer, "Mice and Rites in 1 Samuel v-vi," VT 31 (1981), pp. 293-304.

27 McCarter, p. 119. He rejects, however, the mention of the mice in 6:1.

28 McCarter, p. 129.

As more than one author has complained, it is probably impossible to unravel the textual problems surrounding the tumors and mice in these two chapters.<sup>29</sup> All the authors referred to above have, in one way or another, alluded to the fact that the difficulties and variations in the texts lay already in the literary history of these passages, and the textual problems encountered in the various witnesses seem to be, at least partially, a reflection of this confusion. We have three basic witnesses at our disposal, MT, LXX<sup>B</sup> and LXX<sup>Ant</sup>, and we must see how each treats the tumors and mice before attempting to determine the genuineness of the five golden mice of 6:4:

5:3 MT: וישכמו אשודים ממחרת והנה דגון נפל לפניו ארצה לפני ארון יהוה ויקחו את-דגון וישבו אתו למקום

LXX: και ωρθρισαν οι Αζωτιοι και εισηλθον εις οικον Δαγων (+ τη επαυριον-Ant), και ειδον και ιδου Δαγων πεπτωκως επι προσωπον αυτου (+ επι την γην-Ant) ενωπιον κιβωτου του θεου· και ηγειραν τον Δαγων και κατεστησαν εις τον τοπον αυτου. και εβαρυνθη χειρ Κυριου επι τους Αζωτιους και εβασανισεν αυτους, και επαταξεν αυτους εις τας εδρας αυτων, την Αζωτον και τα ορια αυτης (και εβαρυνθη...αυτης >Ant).

5:6 MT: ותכבד יד-יהוה אל-אשודים וישם ויך אתם בעפלים את-אשוד ואת-גבוליה

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και εβαρυνθη χειρ Κυριου επι Αζωτον και επηγαγεν αυτοις, και εξεξεσεν αυτοις εις τας ναυς, και μεσον της χωρας αυτης ανεφυσαν μυες· και εγενετο συγχυσις θανατον μεγαλη εν τη πολει.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και εβαρυνθη η χειρ Κυριου επι Αζωτον και εβασανιζεν τους Αζωτιους και επαταξεν αυτους εις τας εδρας αυτων, την Αζωτον και το οριον αυτης. και επηγαγεν αυτοις μυας, και εξεβασαν εις τας ναυς αυτων, και εις μεσον της χωρας αυτων ανεφυσαν μυες. και εγενετο συγχυσις θανατου μεγαλη εν τη πολει.

5:9 MT: ויהי אחרי הסבו אתו ותהי יד-יהוה בעיר מהומה גדולה מאד ויך את-אנשי העור מקטן ועד-גדול וישתרו להם עפלים

29 Cf. Schicklberger, Die Ladeerzählung, p. 112; McCarter, p. 119.

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και εγενηθη μετα το μετελθειν αυτην και γινεται χειρ Κυριου τη πολει, ταραχος μεγας σφοδρα' και επαταξεν τους ανδρας της πολεως απο μικρου εως μεγαλου, και επαταξεν αυτους εις τας εδρας αυτων. και εποιησαν εαυτοις οι Γεθθαιοι εδρας.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και εγενετο εν τω μετελθειν την κιβωτον προς τους Γεθθαιους, και γινεται χειρ Κυριος εν τη πολει εν πληθη μεγαλη σφοδρα και επαταξεν τους ανδρας της πολεως απο μικρου εως μεγαλου εις τας εδρας. και εποιησαν οι Γεθθαιοι εδρας χρυσας, και εξεβρασαν εν αυτοις μυες.

6:1 MT: ויהי ארון-יהוה בשדה שבעה שבועות

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ην η κιβωτος εν αγρω των αλλοφυλων επτα μηνας και εξεξεσεν η γη αυτων μυας.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ην η κιβωτος του θεου εν τω αγρω των αλλοφυλων μηνας επτα. και εξεβρασεν η γη αυτων μυας.

6:4 (see above)

6:5 MT: ונחם אלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּבוֹד אֱלֹהֵי יִקְרָא-תָא-יְדוּ מַעֲלִיכֵם וְנִחַם אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְנִחַם אֶרֶץכִּי

LXX: και μυς χρυσους (B; και πεντε μυας χρυσους ποιησατε-Ant) ομοιωμα των μυων υμων των διαφθειροντων την γην. και δωσετε τω Κυριω (+ θεω Ισραηλ-Ant) δοξαν, οπως κουφιση την χειρα αυτου αφ' υμων και απο των θεων υμων και απο της γης υμων.

6:18 MT: ונחם אלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και μυς οι χρυσοι

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και μυες χρυσοι

From these texts indicated above, we may note the following, leaving aside minor variants among them.

1. The plus in LXX 5:3, a considerable part of which is identical to 5:6, is absent in Greek only from Ant, but the vocabulary used there bears a closer resemblance to Ant's translation of 5:6 (εβασανισεν; την Αζωτον και τα ορια αυτης) than to that of cod B for 5:6. In Ant 5:6 εβασανισεν appears to be Ant's translation for מַשְׁחִי. This Greek verb is used elsewhere only in Wis, 2 Macc, 4 Macc, and at



Sir 4:17. In none of these places does it have a Hebrew base.<sup>30</sup>

2. In 5:6, the plus in LXX, which describes the overrunning of the countryside with mice, as well as the "confusion of death" in the city (cf. 5:11 MT), is nearly identical in cod B and Ant, whereas in the first part of the verse, which is shared with MT, Ant seems to have tried to reconcile the Greek text with MT, giving first a literal translation, then the text of cod B with minor variations (adds *μυας*; reads *εξεβρασεν* for *εξεζεσεν*; modifies *αυτοις* to *αυτων*). Note that, while the plus of v.3 (in cod B came from v.6 and the plus at the end of v.6 came from v.11, the additional plus in v.6 LXX, *και μεσον της χωρας αυτης ανεφυσαν μυες*, is the only part of this verse which does not correspond to a Hebrew text from somewhere in the surrounding verses.

3. For MT 5:9 *וַיִּשְׁתְּרוּ לָהֶם עֲפָלִים*, LXX seems to have guessed at this hapax verb with its translation of *επαταξεν* (it has, in fact, simply reproduced a clause from 5:6). Perhaps equally puzzled by the hapax, Ant here has dropped *וַיִּשְׁתְּרוּ*, but maintained OG's *εις τας εδρας*. Note that *מהומה* here is rendered as *ταραχος* in cod B and *εν πληγη* in Ant, whereas both versions have *συγχυσις* in 5:11. The Greek text of 5:9 contains a plus, "And the Gathites made tumors for themselves," to which Ant adds "golden" tumors plus "and the mice pullulated among them," again using its preferred verb *εβραζω* (cf. 5:6; 6:1).

4. In 6:1, LXX has translated according to MT, but then contains, in all Greek texts, the plus which says that "the land broke out with mice". The plus is absent from 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.<sup>31</sup> Note that *εβραζω* in Ant corresponds to *εξεω* in

<sup>30</sup> *Βασανιζειν* appears elsewhere in Theodotion at 1 Sam 15:33, where LXX reads *εσφαξεν* for MT *קטל*. Symmachus used *βασανισθησεται* for *יכנס* in Prv 10:8 (Field, II, p. 329).

<sup>31</sup> McCarter, p. 128.

cod B here just as in 5:6. In 5:6, the verb corresponds to וַיֵּץ and refers to the outbreak of tumors.<sup>32</sup>

5. In 6:4, as noted above, LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> stand together in omitting והמשה עכברי זהב.<sup>33</sup> Ant however has added ποιησατε before the five golden tumors and then ομοιωμα των εδρα εν σπον. In 6:5, it reads πεντε μυας χρυσους ποιησατε ομοιωμα των μυων, in an apparent effort, in these two verses, to harmonize the MT reading with what it found in OG. Note that cod B for 6:5 reads και μυς χρυσους ομοιωμα των μυων, perhaps purposely leaving vague the number of mice in the light of 6:18. Note further that for 6:5a, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> seems to agree with MT for וַעֲשִׂיתָם עֲלֵמִי עֶפְלִיכִם, but is without the personal suffix (against MT and LXX) in the second member here: עֲלֵמִי עֶפְלִיכִם.<sup>34</sup>

Is it possible, amid the confusion of the texts here, to speak of a "net result" of these variants? From the five observations above, it is clear that the majority of pluses in the Greek texts correspond to material found in MT, although sometimes it appears in a different place in the Greek. This is perhaps not sufficiently emphasized by those who suggest a separate tradition to account for the pluses in Greek. If these pluses are eliminated, the only genuine pluses of cod B concern the onslaught of mice at 5:6 and 6:1 (to this Ant has added another mention of mice at 5:9). It is highly significant that the preponderance of Greek verbs employed in these pluses has no Hebrew correspondance elsewhere, and a Hebrew Vorlage is, therefore,

32 Εβζεω "to boil over, break out", has נָכַח at its base only in 1 Sam 5:6. Εβραζω, "to cast ashore; to throw off humors; pullulate", is used once to translate נִיחַ hiphil (Neh 13:28), and appears elsewhere only at 2 Macc 1:12; 5:8 [A].

33 Josephus, however, seems to have known of the five golden mice here: "ἀλλὰ πεντε μὲν ἀνδριαντας...χρυσούς... τοσούτους δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν μυας σπυσσούς..." Ant. VI,10

34 McCarter, p. 129.

suspect. The agreement between MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> at 6:1 favors the same conclusion. The only minus registered in the Greek texts in these two chapters is the absence of the five golden mice at 6:4, although in 6:5 the Greek retained the golden mice, and Ant even added the number five. Thus the pluses and minuses of the Greek, vis-à-vis MT, concern precisely that material which in MT seems to be vague or confused, namely the abrupt mention of the golden mouse images in 6:4 which occurs without the previous mention of a mouse plague, and the fact that there were five golden mice, which seems to contradict 6:18. It would seem, therefore, that the variations in the Greek text have as their express purpose the "correction" of these two difficulties. This would seem to indicate that the modifications were made with precisely the MT form of the text in mind. Ant then they seem to have extended the work of harmonization begun in OG but, at the same time, tried to bring its text closer to MT. If the agreement between MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> at 6:1.5 points to the OG itself as the level at which most of the modifications were made, the absence of the five golden mice in 6:4 in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> may indicate that a Hebrew form of this text also existed which attempted at least to eliminate the contradiction between 6:4 and 6:18. At any rate, the bumpier, seemingly less coordinated text of MT would appear to be another point in favor of its originality. It is hardly likely that a contradiction would have been added to the text.

This explanation does not, of course, clarify the significance of the golden mice or tumors, but it shows that, at least to a certain extent, the variations in Greek are explicable through editorial activity on the part of the Greek translator. The omission of the small phrase in 6:4 LXX which speaks of the five golden mice may have been a simple oversight in LXX due to homeoteleuton, but the fact that it coincidentally facilitates the text makes it highly suspect. The evidence of a rather intense amount of literary activity on the part of the Greek translators, shown by the pluses in 5:3.6 and 6:1, plus the modifications at 5:9;

6:5.18, makes it even more plausible to conclude that the text was modified at 6:4 as well.

For this case, therefore, we accept the longer MT form of 6:4 as the more original, with its mention of the five golden mice, and LXX's shorter text as evidence of later editorial activity designed to remove the contradiction with MT's more primitive text included.

# 1 Sam 19:15

MT: ...וישלח שאול תב-המלאכים לראות את-דוד ולאמר...

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και αποστέλλει επι τον Δαυειδ λεγων...

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και απεστειλεν Σαουλ αγγελους ιδειν τον Δαυειδ λεγων...

In 1 Sam 19:15a, Saul sends out messengers a third time to David, to bring him to be killed. The text of cod B is slightly shorter than MT and Ant since it does not contain לראות המלאכים את-שאו. Vg, Tg and Syr here all follow MT. The fragmentary text of 4QSam<sup>b</sup> contains only ור[לעו but considering the spacing in the manuscript, Cross maintains that לראות המלאכים את-שאו was necessarily present in this Qumran text.<sup>35</sup>

Many commentators take no note of this variant,<sup>36</sup> but of those who do, Nowack and Smith alone maintain a MT corruption here, suggesting that an original וישלח לבית דוד be read.<sup>37</sup> Smith justified his reading noting that "if the messengers had once seen David..., it was superfluous to send them to see him again."<sup>38</sup> It should be noted, however, that the text of vv.11-14 does not say that the messengers ever actually saw David. In fact, to the contrary, they are sent in v.11 "to watch him", לשמו, but since he escapes

35 Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts at Qumran," JBL 74 (1955), p. 167.

36 Keil, Erdmann, Hummelauer, Graetz, Thenius, Wellhausen Klostermann, Driver, Peters, Schulz, Ehrlich, Kittel.

37 Nowack, p. 100; Smith, p. 180.

38 Smith, p. 180.

from the window in v.12, they could not have seen him. When they are sent a second time, in v.14, and Michal<sup>39</sup> tells them, "He is sick", the impression given is that they do not get to see him this time either. There seems to be a definite progression in the narrative which expresses Saul's growing exasperation, either at the ineptitude of the messengers or at David's wiliness. In v.11 he tells them "to watch him and kill him in the morning"; in v.14 he tells them "to take him"; and finally the exasperated Saul tells them in v.15 "to see him" and to bring David so that he himself can kill him. Thus, the לראות of v.15 is far from superfluous, but rather necessary to the drama of the story.

Dhorme suggested a haplography in the LXX text which would have transformed לראות את-דוד into לדוד,<sup>40</sup> but this, besides being unnecessarily complicated ("Le  $\nu$  de לדוד considéré comme  $\nu$  et le double את qui suit tombant par suite du passage du לר à לדוד."), does not account for the absence of the messengers from LXX<sup>B</sup>. A much simpler and more convincing explanation is the loss of את-המלאכים לראות due to homeoarcton from את-המלכים to את-דוד.<sup>41</sup> It would seem, therefore, that the haplography took place already in the Vorlage of LXX, as the Greek form of the text does not lend itself to such an explanation.

Confirmation of the original presence of the messengers in this verse is found in מעלו in v.15b (αγαγετε in LXX). The plural form here ensures that mention of the messengers must have been made earlier on in the verse.

LXX here, therefore, contains an apparently accidental omission due to homeoarcton, while MT witnesses to the more original form of the verse.

39 Reading וואמר with MT and Ant, and not λεγουσιν (B rell).

40 Dhorme, p. 174.

41 Cross; McCarter; Barthélemy, "La qualité...," p. 7.

## 1 Sam 20:34

MT: ויקם והונתן מעם השלחן בחרי-אף ולא-אכל כיום-החדש השני  
 חם כי נעצב אל-דוד כי הכלמו אביו

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ανεπηδησεν Ιωναθαν απο της τραπεζης εν οργη θυμου,  
 και ουκ εφαγεν εν τη δευτερα του μηνος αρτον, οτι  
 συνετελεσεν επ'αυτον ο πατηρ αυτου.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ανεπηδησεν Ιωναθαν απο της τραπεζης εν οργη θυμου,  
 και ουκ εφαγεν αρτον εν τη δευτερα ημερα του μηνος,  
 οτι εθραυσθη επι τον Δαυειδ, οτι εβουλευσατο ο πατηρ  
 αυτου συνετελεσαι αυτον.

The plus here, absent only from cod B, tells of Jonathan's grieving for David after Saul has resolved that he should die. Cod B, which does not contain כי נעצב אל-דוד, reads simply οτι συνετελεσεν επ'αυτον ο πατηρ αυτου, which has led to the suggestion that הכלמו be amended to כלו עליו, and that David be the object of Saul's resolve here. Others have suggested omitting the plus, along with cod B, but retaining הכלמו as in MT.<sup>43</sup> Thus, there are two questions here: is the longer MT or the shorter cod B text more original, and to whom does the waw of הכלמו refer?

Concerning the first question, it must be noted that the shorter text is witnessed to in cod B alone. Οτι εθραυσθη επι τον Δαυειδ, as in MT, is found in every other Greek ms. That it is necessary to the meaning, and not simply an addition, seems clear from the fact that, in LXX's understanding, the final clause of the verse, οτι συνετελεσεν επ'αυτον ο πατηρ αυτου, can refer only to David. It is nowhere question, even in the midst of the insults showered upon Jonathan by Saul, that Saul intends to do away with his son and therefore, the Greek text requires the presence of this clause missing from cod B.<sup>44</sup> That it fell out of cod B by accident through homeoarcton at כי, οτι, is highly probable.

42 Thenius, Wellhausen, Dhorme, Graetz.

43 Smith, Budde, Peters, Hertzberg (who calls the plus a marginal note), McCarter, BJ<sup>1</sup>.

44 Ant seems to have tried to attenuate OG by introducing εβουλευσατο into the clause.

Whether LXX has correctly understood the Hebrew text here brings us to the second question.  $\Sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu$  can in no way be a translation of  $\text{הכלמו}$ , which has led a number of commentators to correct to  $\text{כלה עליו}$ . No one explains, however, how such a corruption might have taken place, and LXX here appears to have misread or misunderstood the verb, perhaps under the influence of  $\text{כלה}$  in vv.7,9 and especially 33 in the same chapter, where it has translated  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$  in all three places. If the true meaning of  $\text{הכלמו}$ , "revile" or "humiliate", is restored here, with MT, it seems that one must either eliminate the preceding clause, as did cod B, or else twist the thrust of the story by having Saul humiliate David here. Another explanation is possible, however, for if  $\text{הכלמו}$  refers to Jonathan, then the meaning of MT seems to be that Jonathan grieved for David precisely because Saul had humiliated Jonathan. If Saul had gone so far as he did in v.30 to revile the memory of Jonathan's mother, this showed how deeply angered he was, and how resolved he was to do away with David. It was this resolve which manifested itself in the strong words against his own son that caused Jonathan to understand the depth of Saul's anger and, therefore, to grieve for David. LXX's translation showed that it misunderstood this reaction on Jonathan's part, and therefore missed the import of the verb  $\text{הכלמו}$ . MT's longer text here makes perfect sense while cod B witnesses to a text that has been damaged by haplography as well as having misunderstood the sense of the narrative.

1 Sam 23:11 f.

MT: היסגרני בעלי קעילה בידו הירד שאול כאשך שמע עבדך יהוה<sup>11</sup>  
אלהי ישראל הגד-נא לעבדך ויאמר יהוה ירד<sup>12</sup> ויאמר דוד  
היסגרו בעלי קעילה אחי ואב-אנשי ביד-שאול ויאמר יהוה יסגירו

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>11</sup>  $\epsilon\iota$  αποκλεισθησεται; και νυν  $\epsilon\iota$  καταβησεται Σαουλ  
 καθως ηκουσεν ο δουλος σου; Κυριε ο θεος Ισραηλ,  
 απαγγειλον τω δουλω σου. <sup>12</sup> και ειπεν Κυριος απο-  
 κλεισθησεται.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: 11 εἰ αποκλεισθήσεται; καὶ νῦν εἰ καταβήσεται Σαουλ καθ' ὥς ηκούσεν ὁ δούλος σου; Κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ, ἀπαγγείλον τῷ δούλῳ σου. καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος Ἀποκλεισθήσεται. 12 καὶ εἶπεν Δαυεὶδ Εἰ παραδωσούσιν οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Κεεὶλα ἐμὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀνδράς μου εἰς χεῖρας Σαουλ; καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος Παραδωσούσιν.

In these verses describing the questions which David put to the Lord through the ephod, concerning his safety at Keilah from the hand of Saul, many commentators find reasons to believe that both MT and LXX have suffered textual corruption.

The opening MT phrase in v.11, הִסְגִּרְנִי בְעֲלֵי קַעִילָה בִּירוֹ, which appears to be an anticipation of MT v.12a, is absent from LXX. In its place is a simple question εἰ αποκλεισθήσεται, followed by καὶ νῦν, which introduces the following sentence. Also missing from LXX (cod B) are the final words of v.11 and almost all of v.12, from וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה to וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה. The text of Ant has maintained OG in its entirety for v.11 but also contains a literal translation for MT v.12.

Thenius attempted to salvage MT v.11a by attaching it to the end of v.10 so as to read בְּעֶבֶר הִסְגִּרְנִי בְעֲלֵי קַעִילָה בִּירוֹ, <sup>45</sup> but this was rejected by Wellhausen on the grounds that "the Arabic construction for Hebrew is totally unprovable."<sup>46</sup> Wellhausen himself maintained that בִּירוֹ...הִסְגִּרְנִי at the beginning of v.11 was accidentally misplaced from v.12. As for the Greek text, it suffered an accident through which the whole of v.12 was lost except for the final word, after which εἰ αποκλεισθήσεται was inserted in its present position in an attempt to repair the damage. As a result it should be eliminated.<sup>47</sup> While all commentators are in agreement that LXX vv.11b-12 fell out through homeoarcton at וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה,

<sup>45</sup> Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 99.

<sup>46</sup> Wellhausen, p. 128 note.

<sup>47</sup> Wellhausen, p. 128, followed by Smith, Peters, Nowack, Dhorme, McCarter, Dhorme (1956), Osty, BJ.



not all have accepted Wellhausen's explanation for MT v.11a. Budde attributed the repetition to the convergence of two sources here,<sup>48</sup> but because of the fact that the question is repeated in exactly the same terms in v.12, it would seem difficult to speak definitely of a different source here. Cross has pointed out that, because of space considerations, the clause must have been absent from 4QSam<sup>b</sup> although the fragment shows that there was space enough for וַיֵּחָד, corresponding to LXX καὶ οὖν.<sup>49</sup>

Wellhausen's appeal to dittography seems difficult to sustain here, however, for two reasons: the supposed dittograph of v.11a anticipates the clause in v.12, and further, the two clauses differ sufficiently so as to rule out accidental copying:

11 היסגרני בעלי קעילה בידו

12 היסגרו בעלי קעילה אחי ואח-אנשי ביד-שאול

If one admits an accidental repetition here, with Wellhausen, one must at the same time credit the "distracted" scribe with supplying the correct personal pronouns in v.11a for the phrase that he supposedly anticipated.

That the MT form of v.11 with its anticipated question has posed problems already early on may be seen in the early versions. Vg, for example, though it follows MT, tried to smooth out the difficulty by joining the two questions of v.11: "Si tradent me viri Ceila in manus eius et si descendit Saul...". Syr, on the other hand, omits David's question about Saul's descent: "Will the leaders of the city hand me over, and the men who are with me, to the hand of Saul? And the Lord said, 'They will hand you over. Rise and flee from the town'."<sup>50</sup> The Babylonian Talmud saw in David's question a lack of proper form which necessitated the repetition of his first question.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>48</sup> Budde, KHAT, p. 157.

<sup>49</sup> Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts...", p. 170.

<sup>50</sup> The final clause of Syr, sm pwq mn qryt, seems to have been inspired by the beginning of v.13.

<sup>51</sup> "One should not put two questions at the same time; if one has done so only one [question] is answered." Yoma

These early versions and interpretations, while not useful for correcting the text, may nonetheless suggest how MT is to be understood. Within the context of the narrative, David's initial question is not as out of place as it might appear. In 23:4 f. we are told that David, acting upon the Lord's instructions, went down and delivered the town of Keilah from the Philistines. According to vv.11a $\beta$  and 12, he asks two questions for which he receives answers through the ephod. The anticipation of the question concerning the burghers of Keilah in v.11a $\alpha$ , whether or not they will hand him over, however, shows his real concern, and David, in his agitated state, blurts it out before formally putting the questions to the oracle for the Lord's response.<sup>52</sup> A further sign of this is that this first question in MT is not followed by an invocation to the Lord. When he asks in v.11b if Saul will come down, it is followed by, "O Lord God of Israel, I beseech you, tell your servant."

Returning to the LXX form of v.11, we see that the initial  $\epsilon\iota\ \alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  is not an exact translation of  $\text{הִיִּסְגִּירִי}$ , and may show an attempt on the part of LXX or its Vorlage to adjust what it perhaps considered an erroneous beginning to v.11. Wellhausen eliminated the two words as a later insertion and was followed by a number of exegetes and modern translations. Stoebe attributes it to a different recension which LXX followed. He objects to Wellhausen's proposal on the grounds that "an addition which obscures a clear text is difficult to imagine."<sup>53</sup> As Klostermann pointed out, the Greek  $\epsilon\iota\ \alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  is a reference to the city, mentioned in v.10.<sup>54</sup> Thus, in LXX, instead of asking whether the burghers will hand him over, as he does in MT, David asks if the city of Keilah will be closed off.

---

73ab (trans. L. Jung) in The Babylonian Talmud. Mo'ed III, edited by I. Epstein (London, 1938), p. 351.

52 Cf. Clair, La Sainte Bible avec Commentaires (Paris, 1884), cited by Hummelauer, p. 215.

53 Stoebe, p. 419.

54 Klostermann, p. 101.

There is no trace of such a question in MT, but the solution to the difference may be found in the verb  $\gamma\lambda\sigma$  and in the way LXX has handled it.

Ordinarily, in Hebrew,  $\gamma\lambda\sigma$  in niph'al means "to be shut up, to be closed" (cf. 1 Sam 23:7). In hiph'il, it usually means "to deliver up" (e.g. 1 Sam 23:20; 30:15). It can, however, also mean "to shut up" in hiph'il, although this is a later meaning, and found chiefly in Lev 13.<sup>55</sup> The LXX has used a rather large variety of verbs to translate  $\gamma\lambda\sigma$ . For its use in qal, meaning "to shut up",  $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  (twelve times) and its compounds,  $\alpha\pi\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  (twelve times),  $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  eleven times), and  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\pi\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  (twice) are the most common.<sup>56</sup> For  $\gamma\lambda\sigma$  niph'al, "to be shut up",  $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  (thrice),  $\alpha\pi\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  (once only, at 1 Sam 23:7),  $\epsilon\gamma\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  and  $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  (once each), and  $\alpha\phi\omicron\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$  (twice) are used. For  $\gamma\lambda\sigma$  hiph'il, "to deliver up",  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\iota\delta\omicron\nu\alpha\iota$  (five times plus twice in Sir),  $\epsilon\zeta\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$  (once), but also  $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  (once),  $\alpha\pi\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  (once),  $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  (seven times), and  $\alpha\phi\omicron\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$  (eleven times, all in Lev 13 f.), are used.

That  $\gamma\lambda\sigma$ , hiph'il, can mean "to shut in" may be seen from Lev 13 f., but even when its meaning is clearly "to deliver up", LXX has frequently translated by  $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  or one of its compounds.<sup>57</sup> On the other hand, LXX has correctly translated  $\gamma\lambda\sigma$  hiph'il by  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\iota\delta\omicron\nu\alpha\iota$  sufficiently often enough to indicate that it was aware of this meaning.<sup>58</sup>

In 1 Sam 23:7,  $\text{jsut}$  a few verses before our text, MT  $\gamma\lambda\sigma$  is rendered as  $\alpha\pi\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ . If  $\gamma\lambda\sigma$  of 23:11 posed a problem for LXX or its Vorlage, because of the seeming inconvenience in repeating the question, it would not

55 Cf. BDB s.  $\gamma\lambda\sigma$ .

56 In addition to these,  $\alpha\nu\alpha\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$  and  $\kappa\upsilon\pi\tau\epsilon\iota\nu$  are each used once.

57 Cf.  $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  (1 Sam 23:20);  $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$  (Jos 20:5; Am 1:6.9; Pss 31:8; 78:50.62).

58 1 Sam 30:15; Dt 23:16; 32:30; Job 16:11; Ps 78:48.

have been difficult to read it as a niphal, make the question refer to the city which had just been mentioned, and drop the rest of the clause since it appeared again in the following verse. If one admits, then, that some editorial activity has taken place at the beginning of v.11, it is possible at the same time to see the καὶ νῦν as a further "correction" in order to introduce the following question.<sup>59</sup> Cross has shown that in the 4QSam<sup>b</sup> fragment containing 23:11 f. there is not enough room for the text of MT v.11a but ἀνῶι would be able to fit nicely.<sup>60</sup> It is possible, therefore, that this variant text was already present in LXX's Vorlage. Cross follows Wellhausen in rejecting the initial εἰ αποκλεισθήσεται, and he points out that with ἀνῶι "the line count in 67 characters, only slightly under the general mean for all the fragments (71/72)."<sup>61</sup> It may be observed, however, that this general mean would still allow room for a form such as ῥᾶπῃ which would account for αποκλεισθήσεται.

Since the verb αποκλεισθήσεται is repeated in what appears to be the end of v.12 in LXX, it may be asked to what extent the two are related. In comparison with MT, LXX vv.11 f. are greatly truncated and virtually all commentators have seen an accident due to homeoarcton in LXX here, as mentioned above. Wellhausen's theory that εἰ αποκλεισθήσεται in v.11a was an insertion from v.12 does not account for why it was translated that way in v.12, where one would expect the παραδωσουσιν that Ant provides.<sup>62</sup> That

59 Cf. Schulz I, p. 340.

60 Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts...", p. 170.

61 Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts...", p. 170.

62 V.12 in its entirety is present in mss A N b c e g j(mg) m(mg) o w x z c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub>. The only notable variant among is found in N, which reads συγκλείουσιν for παραδωσουσιν both times.

Ant reproduces the text of cod B v.11 in its entirety with no changes before adding its own translation of v.12<sup>63</sup> shows that cod B is the older form of the Greek here. For the αποκλεισθησεται which ends LXX v.12, it is not an exact translation of the plural יִסְגִּירוּ, and appears to have been influenced by the αποκλεισθησεται which lies at the beginning of LXX v.11 both by the fact that it is in the singular and that it betrays LXX's apparent understanding of יִסְגִּירוּ as niphal here, or at least with the meaning "to be shut up" and as referring to the city.

A. Kamphausen has pointed out another possibility for the original form of vv.11 f.<sup>64</sup> David knew already in v.9 that Saul was plotting evil against him, and so he had no need to ask of the oracle if Saul was coming down to Keilah. What he did not know, however, was how the people of Keilah would react. Kamphausen's suggestion is that the first four words of v.11 and the last three of v.12 constituted the original narrative.<sup>65</sup> Whether or not the question concerning Saul's coming down is a later insertion or not, the fact that both MT and 4QSam<sup>b</sup> contain the longer form, as well as the fact that LXX contains at least a tattered remnant of this form, indicates that if a shorter form had existed, it must be at least prior to MT's and LXX's common ancestor.

Tg may have wished to show that it saw something slightly irregular about the oracle here, reflected in its

- 
- 63 At least according to ms o, which Lagarde appears to have followed here for his text. In place of the erroneous αποκλεισθησεται as the response to David's question about Saul, b'b(txt) have καταβησεται και ειπε Κυριος; b(mg) καταβησεται; e<sub>2</sub> και ειπε Κυριος καταβησεται.
- 64 A. Kamphausen, "Philister und Hebräer zur Zeit Davids," ZAW 6 (1886), p. 80, note 1, followed by Schulz.
- 65 Klostermann (p. 102) maintained essentially the same position, although he considered vv.10-11 to be an "aufputzende Verbreiterung" to the original story which passed directly from v.9 to v.12.

use of the verb סבר, "to think, plan", in the questions asked by David. He asks, "Is Saul planning to come down? (הסביר למחשואו); "Are the men of Keilah planning to hand me over? (הסבירין למחשורי). Perhaps the fact that Saul did not actually come down after all, nor did the men of Keilah hand David over, even though the oracle of the Lord had responded affirmatively to both questions, inspired the Targum to soften the questions so as not to make it seem as if the oracle of the Lord had made a mistake here.

For these two verses, a comparison of MT and LXX has shown that LXX's Vorlage has apparently suffered an accident through homeoarcton, while LXX itself misinterpreted David's question in v.11a. MT, on the other hand, seems to witness to the most original form of the text.

#### 1 Sam 25:13a

MT: ויאמר דוד לאנשיו חגרו איש את-חרבו ויחגרו איש את-חרבו ויחגר גם-דוד את-חרבו ויעלו אחרי דוד

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ειπεν Δαυειδ τοις ανδρασιν αυτου Ζωσασθε εκαστος την ρομφαιαν αυτου· και ανεβησαν οπισω Δαυειδ...

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ειπεν Δαυειδ τοις ανδρασιν αυτου Ζωσασθε εκαστος την μαχαिरαν αυτου· και περιεζωσαντο τας μαχαिरας αυτων. και Δαυειδ και αυτος εξωσατο την μαχαिरαν αυτου. και ανεβησαν οπισω Δαυειδ...

In 1 Sam 25:13, where David, angered by Nabal's shabby treatment of his men, orders them to prepare for battle against Nabal, the MT contains a plus which is not found in cod B,<sup>66</sup> which says that the men put on their swords and that David put his sword on as well. Of all the commentators, Schulz alone suggested that the plus in MT is not original. Quoting Grimm's opinion that "Leistet der Satz an epischer Breite etwas zu viel,"<sup>67</sup> he concluded that the plus is an addition to the text.<sup>68</sup> NEB and Eü accept only half of the

66 The plus is absent as well from mss a d h i j l n p q t v y\* a<sub>2</sub> b<sub>2</sub>.

67 Grimm, BZ (1904), p. 43.

68 Schulz I, p. 359.

plus: "He said to his men, 'Buckle on your swords, all of you.' So they buckled on their swords and followed David...."<sup>69</sup> All other commentators who take note of the 'minus' explain the absence in cod B through a haplography because of homeoteleuton, from the first  $\alpha\mu\chi\alpha\iota\rho\alpha\iota$  to the third.<sup>70</sup> The longer text seems more satisfying not only from the point of view of the logic of the narrative, but also from that of the grammar of the verse, as  $\omega\iota\epsilon\lambda\omega$  in v.13b thus has a more specific antecedent.

It is instructive to note the form of this verse as found in cod A as well. While it contains the plus, a comparison of the three major Greek text forms shows:

<u>cod B</u>	<u>cod A</u>	<u>b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub></u>
$\rho\omicron\mu\phi\alpha\iota\alpha\nu$	$\rho\omicron\mu\phi\alpha\iota\alpha\nu$	$\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\rho\alpha\nu$
	+ και περιεζωσαντο ανηρ την μαχαιραν αυτου και περιεζω- σαντο και Δαυειδ την μαχαιραν αυτου	+ και περιεζωσαντο τας μαχαιρας αυτων και Δαυειδ και αυτος εζωσαντο την μαχαιραν αυτου
$\omega\varsigma$	$\omega\varsigma$	omit
$\omicron\iota$	$\omicron\iota$	omit
$\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$	$\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$	$\epsilon\pi\iota$

The absence of this plus from cod B, plus the X accompanying it in ms c<sub>2</sub> indicate that it was genuinely absent from the original OG. In addition, the following characteristics within the Greek of the plus section are significant:

1.  $\omega\iota\epsilon$ , in the sense of "each", appears twice in MT. For the first, which is contained in B, all Greek mss share  $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ . For the second, where B is lacking, all have  $\alpha\nu\eta\rho$  except b o c<sub>2</sub> e<sub>2</sub> which do not translate it at all.

<sup>69</sup> The mss e g alone contain this reading.

<sup>70</sup> Thenius, Budde, Dhorme, Stoebe, McCarter, Barthélemy.

2. For  $\gamma \text{ } \alpha \text{ } \beta \text{ } \gamma$ ,  $\beta \text{ } \alpha \text{ } \gamma \text{ } \beta$  again distinguish themselves, this time with ms z, from the others. The Ant mss have  $\Delta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota\delta \alpha\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$  while the rest read  $\alpha\iota \Delta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota\delta$ .<sup>71</sup>

3. The group  $\beta \text{ } \alpha \text{ } \gamma \text{ } \beta$  again stands apart in translating  $\gamma \text{ } \alpha \text{ } \beta$  as  $\epsilon\zeta\omega\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$ , while  $z^*$  reads  $\epsilon\zeta\omega\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$  and the rest  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\zeta\omega\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$  ( $N^*$ - $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\zeta\omega\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$ ).

4. For the translation of  $\gamma \text{ } \alpha \text{ } \beta$ , where cod B is present, all have  $\rho\omicron\mu\phi\alpha\iota\nu$  except  $\beta \text{ } \alpha \text{ } \gamma \text{ } \beta$   $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\rho\alpha\nu$ . But where cod B is absent, all who contain the plus read  $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\rho\alpha\nu$  both times.<sup>72</sup> In the variation  $\rho\omicron\mu\phi\alpha\iota\alpha/\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\rho\alpha$  in Sam-Kgs, Ant reads  $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\rho\alpha$  where all others have  $\rho\omicron\mu\phi\alpha\iota\alpha$  at Sam 17:39.47; 21:8 (bis); 25:13a; 31:4 (bis).<sup>73</sup> Ant reads  $\rho\omicron\mu\phi\alpha\iota\alpha$  where all others have  $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\rho\alpha$  at 2 Sam 11:25; 18:8; 23:10.<sup>74</sup> Apart from these instances, in the other thirty-eight occurrences of  $\rho\omicron\mu\phi\alpha\iota\alpha$  and the other seven of  $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\rho\alpha$  in Sam-Kgs, there is no variation between Ant and the rest of the mss. If modifications have been made by Ant and/or by the *kaigé* recension, they seem to have been sporadic and not systematic. What is significant at 1 Sam 25:13, however, is the agreement between Ant and cod A on  $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\rho\alpha$  where cod B is missing, whereas cod A agrees with B on  $\rho\omicron\mu\phi\alpha\iota\alpha$  against Ant.<sup>74</sup>

5. Three further agreements between B and A against Ant are to be found in  $\omega\varsigma$ ,  $\omicron\iota$ , and  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$  against Ant's omit, omit, and  $\epsilon\pi\iota$ .

71 Only mss N <244> read  $\alpha\iota\gamma\epsilon$  here for  $\gamma \text{ } \alpha \text{ } \beta$ .

72 With the minor variation that for  $\gamma \text{ } \alpha \text{ } \beta$   $2^\circ \text{ } \beta \text{ } \alpha \text{ } \gamma \text{ } \beta$  read the plural  $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\rho\alpha\varsigma$ , and for  $\gamma \text{ } \alpha \text{ } \beta$   $c \text{ } x$  stand alone with  $\rho\omicron\mu\phi\alpha\iota\nu$ .

73 At 2 Sam 23:8 Ant reads  $\delta\iota\alpha\sigma\alpha\epsilon\upsilon\eta\nu$  for LXX  $\rho\omicron\mu\phi\alpha\iota\alpha$ , where the word is absent from MT.

74 In three other places, 1 Sam 17:50; 18:4; 22:19, where cod B is also missing, Ant agrees with A as well for  $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\rho\alpha$ .



6. The final item to be noted is cod A's strict literalism vis-à-vis MT και περιεζωσαντο ανηρ την μαχαιραν αυτου against Ant's more polished και περιεζωσαντο τας μαχαιρας αυτων.

These observations show that, in general, where cod B is present, A is closer both to B and to MT. For the section where cod B is missing, A is closer to MT than is Ant, which may show that Ant here is the later of the two, more independent and less literal and manifesting better Greek than A.

For this text, MT, along with Ant and A, which contain the longer reading, is the more original, while cod B witnesses to an accidental loss of a whole section through homeoteleuton.

#### 1 Sam 26:5

MT: ויקם דוד ויבא אל-המקום אשר הנח-שם שאול וירא דוד תא-המקום  
אשר שכב-שם שאול ואבנר בן-נר שר-צבאו ושואל שכב במעגל והעם  
ננים סביבו

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και ανεστη Δαυειδ λαθρα και εισπορευεται εις τον  
τοπον ου εκαθευδεν εκει Σαουλ, και εκει Αβεννηρ  
υιος Νηρ αρχιστρατηγος αυτου· και Σαουλ εκαθευδεν  
εν λαμπηνη και ο λαος παρεμβεβληκως κυκλω αυτου.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: και ανεστη Δαυειδ λαθραιως και επορευθη εις τον τοπον  
ου εκθευδεν Σαουλ. και ειδεν Δαυειδ τον τοπον ου  
εκοιμηθη εκει Σαουλ, και Αβεννηρ υιος Νηρ αρχιστρα-  
τηγος αυτου εκει. και Σαουλ εκαθευδεν εν λαμπηνη, και  
ο λαος παρεμβεβληκως κυκλω αυτου.

At 1 Sam 26:5, where David goes into Saul's camp to reconnoiter, MT contains a plus vis-à-vis cod B which says that David saw the place where Saul was sleeping. Ant contains the plus as well, or at least a part of it.

Wellhausen led the way in explaining the absence of the words in cod B through haplography, from the first אשר המקום to the second.<sup>75</sup> Stoebe, on the other hand, attributes the absence rather to an "exegetische Beurteilung

<sup>75</sup> Wellhausen, p. 136, followed by Budde, Dhorme, Schulz, McCarter. All modern translations follow the fuller MT.

des Zusammenhanges."<sup>76</sup> A possible point in favor of Stoebe's suggestion is the repetitive, almost parallel character of the phrases וירא...שאוּל and ויבא...שאוּל, which LXX may have undertaken to simplify. His suggestion would be more convincing, however, if LXX had suppressed one or the other of these phrases. As the omission in cod B stands,<sup>77</sup> the latter part of the first phrase and the former part of the second are absent, which indicates a textual accident rather than a conscious modification.

The Ant text seems to have noticed the accidental omission and tried to replace it from the MT, but appears to have been led astray by the repetitive nature of the verse. Apparently having taken CG ου εκαθευδεν εκει Σαουλ to be the translation of וירא...שאוּל חנה-שם instead of וירא...שאוּל שכב-שם, it began with וירא וירא (και ειδεν Δαυειδ...) and went on from there as in MT. The result is that in Ant שכב-שם appears to have been translated twice (ου εκαθευδεν εκει from OG and then its own ου εκουμηθη εκει) while וירא...שאוּל חנה-שם has disappeared entirely.<sup>78</sup> Another explanation of Ant's text could be that it translated חנה as εκαθευδεν, but the presence of this verb already in OG, plus the fact that nowhere else is חנה translated this way, would seem to exclude this.<sup>79</sup> Further, the Greek translators do not seem to have had any difficulty in recognizing the true meaning of חנה when it occurred in v.3 (παρενεβαλεν), or in v.5 (παρεμβεβληκως).<sup>80</sup>

76 Stoebe, p. 463.

77 The plus is absent as well from mss A M N a d g h j l n p q t v y a<sub>2</sub> b<sub>2</sub>.

78 This same sort of confusion seems to be behind Smith's analysis of the textual accident when he says that "GAB omits the clause וירא...שאוּל by homeoteleuton" (p. 231).

79 Out of twenty-nine occurrences of εκαθευδεν, שכב lies behind it twenty-four times, ישן four times, and ישב once.

80 Vg, for וירא...שאוּל חנה here reads ubi erat. Perhaps St. Jerome misread חנה for חנה. Only one Vg ms, Sangermanensis Par. lat. 11937 has ubi castramentus erat.

A strong indication of the genuineness of the MT over against the shorter LXX here is the fact that the whole purpose of David's visit to the Israelite camp was to reconnoiter and locate the spot where Saul slept. If the sentence which describes David's actually seeing the spot is missing, the scene loses its entire force. Gressmann suggested that the second half of this verse took away the surprise from v.7,<sup>81</sup> but if David, in v.5, sees only the place where Saul is accustomed to sleep (note the imperfect *εκαθευδεν* in Greek), and does not see Saul actually sleeping, then nothing is taken away from v.7. V.5b *ושאול שכב במעגל* may be considered to be in apposition to the *מקום*, a further specification of Saul's accustomed sleeping-place. If David was able to see all this, it must, after all, have still been daytime, so Saul presumably had not yet gone to bed. In this vein, the precision *לילה* in v.7 indicates that night has come and *והנה שאול שכב ישן במעגל* shows that David had indeed seen rightly that that was his sleeping-place.

For this verse, therefore, cod B has suffered a haplography which Ant has only partially repaired. MT witnesses to the longer, but more original, text.

## 2 Sam 6:3 f.

MT: <sup>3</sup> וירכבו את-ארון האלהים אל-עגלה חדשה וישארו מבית אבינודב  
<sup>4</sup> אשר בגבעה ועזא ואחיו בני אבינודב נהגים את-העגלה חדשה  
 וישארו מבית אבינודב אשר בגבעה עם ארון האלהים ואחיו הלך  
 לפני הארון

LXX<sup>B</sup>: <sup>3</sup> και επεβιβασεν την κιβωτον Κυριου εφ'αμαξαν και ινην  
 και ηρεν αυτην εις οικον Αμειναδαβ του εν τω βουνω·  
 και Οζα και οι αδελφοι αυτου υιοι Αμειναδαβ ηγαν  
 την αμαξαν <sup>4</sup>συν τη κιβωτω, και οι αδελφοι αυτου  
 επορευοντο εμπροσθεν της κιβωτου.

LXX<sup>Ant</sup>: <sup>3</sup> και επεβιβασαν την κιβωτον του θεου επι αμαξαν  
 και ινην. <sup>4</sup>και ηρεν αυτην εξ οικου Αβιναδαβ του εν τω  
 βουνω. και Οζα και οι αδελφοι αυτου, υιοι Αβιναδαβ,  
 ηγον την αμαξαν συν τη κιβωτω του θεου, και Οζα  
 και οι αδελφοι αυτου, υιοι Αβιναδαβ επορευοντο  
 εμπροσθεν και εκ πλαγιων της κιβωτου.

<sup>81</sup> Gressmann, "Textkritische Anmerkungen" p. 7 (supplement to Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung, 21921).

4QSam<sup>a</sup>:<sup>82</sup>

[יהו] ה' על עג[לה]... מבית א[ביןדב]... נהגים א[ת]ה  
והעגלה ע[ם]--[ה]א[ת]ה

1 Chr 13:7

MT: וירכבו את-ארון האלהים על-עגלה חדשה מבית אביןדב ועזא  
ואחיו נהגים בעגלה

LXX<sup>B</sup>: και επεθηκαν την κιβωτον του θεου επι αμαξαν καινην  
εξ οικου Αμειναδαβ· και Οζα και οι αδελφοι αυτου  
ηγον την αμαξαν.

In these verses which describe the bringing of the ark from the house of Abinadab, MT contains a longer, repetitive text. From Cappel on, virtually all commentators have seen a dittography of six words in MT,<sup>83</sup> from the final word of v.3, חדשה, to בגבעה of v.4. The conclusive grammatical proof of the erroneous MT is the lack of article with חשה while it is supposed to be modifying העגלה.<sup>84</sup>

A comparison of MT with LXX, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and with the parallel text at 1 Chr 13:7 confirms the textual accident in MT here. Thus, the original Hebrew form, from v.3b on, will have read: ועזא ואחיו בני אביןדב נהגים את-העגלה עם ארון. האלהים ואחיו הלך לפני הארון.

That the correct form of the text, as found in cod B, may still have undergone some editorial activity is seen in εις οικον, corresponding to MT מבית. This may be due either to an editor's misunderstanding of the action here, thinking that the ark was brought to Abinadab's house and that its removal is described in και Οζα...ηγαν την αμαξαν..., or to an attempt to harmonize the activity in those mss which contain the dittograph. Mss B A c x y a<sub>2</sub> read εις here, and mss A c j(mg) x contain the plus as in MT. Thus, first the ark would have been brought to his house, and then carried away from it (cf. απο οικου in A c j(mg) x).

<sup>82</sup> Ulrich, QTSJ, pp. 194 f.

<sup>83</sup> NEB and TOB stand practically along in including the dittography.

<sup>84</sup> Thus all commentaries from Thenius to Barthélemy.

That the presence of this plus in MT has caused some early confusion may be seen from the ancient versions:

Vg: <sup>3</sup>et inposuerunt arcam Domini super plastrum novum tuleruntque eam de domo Abinadab qui erat in Gabaa. Oza autem et Haio filii Abinadab minabant plastrum novum. <sup>4</sup>cumque tulissent eam de domo Abinadab qui erat in Gabaa custodiens arcam Dei Haio praecedebant arcam.

Tg: ואחיתו ית ארונא דיי בעגלתא חדתא ונטלוהי מבית אבינודב די <sup>3</sup>  
 בגבעתא ועזא ואחיו בני אבינודב מדברין ית עגלתא חדתא <sup>4</sup>  
 ונטלוהי מבית אבינודב די בגבעתא עם ארונא דיי ואחיו אזיל  
 קדם ארונא

Syr: <sup>3</sup>wsmwhy l'rwñh d'lh' c<sup>1</sup> l' c<sup>1</sup>glt' hdt' wšqlwhy mn byt 'byndb  
 dbgb<sup>c</sup>t' w<sup>c</sup>z' w'z' w'hy' bny<sup>c</sup>'byndb mdbryn l'c<sup>1</sup>glt' b'hryt'.  
<sup>4</sup>wšqlwhy mn byt 'byndb dbgb<sup>c</sup> l'rwñh d'lh'w'hy' 'zl qdm  
 'rwn'.

Thus, only Tg follows MT exactly here while both Vg and Syr have introduced minor variations, most likely to accommodate themselves to the unintelligible dittography. In Vg, the second וישאו was translated as cum tulissent, whereas the first was simply tuleruntque, and עם ארון ה' became custodiens arcam Dei. In Syr, for the final word of v.3, in place of hdt' it transformed it into b'hryt' - "after", and with l'rwñh instead of עם ארון it seems to have eliminated the difficult preposition by making the ark the direct object of šglw.

The text of Ant appears to have been modified as well. In v.4 it contains και Οζα before και οι αδελφοι αυτου, and has placed οσοι Αβιναδαβ after it. Houbigant recommended the addition of ועזא before עם ארון, claiming that when a scribe saw ועזא after בגבעה, just as in v.3, he did not repeat it.<sup>85</sup> Similarly, Thenius suggested the addition of הלך ועזא before עם ארון.<sup>86</sup> As we have seen, Ant reintroduces Uzzah in v.4, but after σου τη και βρωθε θεου and not before it as Houbigant suggested.

<sup>85</sup> Houbigant, p. 287.

<sup>86</sup> Thenius<sup>1</sup>, p. 152, followed by Wellhausen, Löhr, Budde, Nowack, Driver, Dhorme (1910), Ehrlich, Smith, Kittel, Hertzberg, BJ, Osty, NAB.

The crux for the understanding of Ant's text and for the second mention of Uzzah seems to lie in the understanding of יוֹאָחִי. OG read και οι αδελφοι in vv.3 and 4. Such a reading fits in well enough in v.3 -- "Uzzah and his brothers, the sons of Abinadab", but in v.4, if one follows MT, as OG seems to have done, יוֹאָחִי is too far removed from its antecedent to make good sense as "and his brothers". Further, there seems to be no reason to give a plural meaning to הָיָה in MT such as OG is forced to do (επορευοντο) by its vocalization of יוֹהָיָה. The word makes perfectly good sense as a proper name, Ahio, such as Vg interpreted it. By misreading יוֹאָחִי here, OG introduced a problem in the text which Ant resolved by bringing Uzzah back into the picture. Since he had been mentioned in the previous verse this was easily done. Then, since MT and OG say only that Ahio (or "and his brothers") was before the ark, Ant, in the light of v.6 where Uzzah unfortunately put out his hand to steady the ark when the oxen stumbled, positions the brothers not only εμπροσθεν, but also εκ πλαγιων της κιβωτου.

That the proper name Ahio is to be preferred here may also be seen from v.3. After the mention of Uzzah, another proper name seems more likely in the formula "Uzzah and X, sons of Abinadab".<sup>87</sup> Confirmation of Ahio, finally, seems to be found in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> הַעֲבָדָה עַל יוֹאָחִי. Since אָחִי appears not to be present in v.4, the unlikelihood of "and his brothers" being there is increased.

Wellhausen suggested reading a singular יוֹאָחִי ("and his brother") here, which implies the insertion of Uzzah into the text.<sup>88</sup> In addition to the problem of Uzzah's absence here, neither the Greek nor any other version has the singular here.

Budde, although he opted for the proper name Ahio in SBOT and KHAT, later suggested the singular "and his brother" as well, claiming that it was probably Zadok, whose

87 Cf. Smith, p. 293; Budde, SBOT, p. 81.

88 Wellhausen, p. 167.

name had been purposely omitted from the text when he became recognized as the son of Ahitub and as a descendant of Eleazar, son of Aaron, in order to legitimate his priesthood.<sup>89</sup> Budde maintained that וַיְצִיֹק אֹהֵי was originally read both here and in 2 Sam 15:24 ff., basing this conclusion on the fact that two and only two men were necessary as guardians and carriers of the ark. Of the two indicated in 2 Sam 15:24 vv., Abiathar must have arrived at this task after the entry of the ark into Jerusalem since until then he was known as the one who carried the ephod. Budde suggested that Abiathar was included here in 2 Sam 15 as one of the two carriers because, after the death of Uzzah, who would be identified with Eleazar, in 2 Sam 6:7, only one remained. Thus, the brother mentioned in 2 Sam 6:3 f. is the same as the other ark carrier mentioned in 15:24 ff., namely Zadok.

This argumentation seems, however, rather precarious since the two men mentioned in 6:3 f. do not really appear to be guardians and carriers of the ark in the same sense that 15:24 ff. seems to intend. They seem rather to fall into the category of the men of Kiriath-jearim, in 1 Sam 7:1, who "came and took up the ark of the Lord", rather than the category of Eleazar, Abinadab's son who had to be specially consecrated for his task of looking after the ark. Chapter six speaks of no special consecration for these two sons, nor do they seem to have been entitled to touch the ark, as Uzzah's sudden death appears to indicate. Hertzberg has pointed out the further difficulty that if Uzzah of 2 Sam 6:3 f. is to be identified with Eleazar of 1 Sam 7:1, he must have been very old by that time.<sup>90</sup> Finally, such an explanation must necessarily posit the presence of וְעִזָּא in v.4. As Schulz has pointed out, the absence

---

89 K. Budde, "Die Herkunft Sadok's," ZAW 52 (1934), pp. 48 ff. See also E. Sellin, Geschichte des Israelitisch-Jüdischen Volkes. Erster Teil (Leipzig, 1924), pp. 167 and 169.

90 Hertzberg, p. 278.





LXX<sup>be</sup> 2: <sup>23</sup>και νυν Κυριε, ο λογος σου ον ελαλησας προς τον παιδα σου και επι τον οικον αυτου πιστωθητω εως αιωνος. και ποιησον καθως ελελησας. <sup>24</sup>και πιστωθητω και μεγαλυνθητω το ονομα σου εως αιωνος λεγοντων Κυριος παντοκρατωρ ο θεος του Ισραηλ θεος τω Ισραηλ, και ο οικος Δαυειδ του παιδος σου ητοιμασμενος ενωπιον σου. <sup>25</sup>οτι συ, Κυριε ο θεος μου απεκαλυψας...

In the middle of David's prayer in 2 Sam 7, we find a case in which MT contains both a plus and a minus vis-à-vis cod B in vv.25-27. In this case, the MT for the parallel passage in 1 Chr 17:23-25 also contains a plus vis-à-vis its Greek text of cod B, although the two are not co-extensive.

Only a few commentators have taken note of this variant for 2 Sam here. Budde followed Smith in proposing that the text missing in 2 Sam cod B, from אמר in v.26 to כִּי-אֵל in v.27, is due to an expansion in the MT which was an insertion made by the Chronicler which later affected the text of Samuel.<sup>92</sup> Dhorme, on the other hand, explained the omission in 2 Sam cod B through a haplography caused by homeoteleuton at יהוה צבאות.<sup>93</sup>

In this case, a simple accident of haplography does not seem sufficient to explain entirely the form of the text in cod B, because of the absence there of any trace of אמר. Rehm suggested that the word was "perhaps purposely left out since it was unintelligible."<sup>94</sup> It appears, however, in almost all the Greek texts except cod B and its affiliates,<sup>95</sup> as well as in the Greek for 1 Chr 17:24. It may be that the problematic אמר was purposely left out of the Vorlage of LXX, but that at the same time more was excised that was intended since in eliminating אמר the scribe's eye passed over to the second יהוה צבאות. That it was the second יהוה צבאות that was read and not the first is indicated by

<sup>92</sup> Smith, p. 304. Budde, KHAT, p. 237.

<sup>93</sup> Dhorme, p. 332.

<sup>94</sup> Rehm, Textkritische Untersuchungen, p. 15.

<sup>95</sup> Mss a h v a<sub>2</sub>, as well as the hexaplaric A c x.

του Ισραηλ, corresponding to  $\text{לְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$  of v.27 rather than to  $\text{לְיִשְׂרָאֵל־לֵךְ}$  of v.26. Thus, the absence of this MT plus in B is due to homeoarcton at  $\text{יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת}$ . Then later,  $\text{Κυrie Παντοκρατω θεε του Ισραηλ}$  was re-inserted into the text represented by cod B, but after the  $\text{εως του αιωνος}$  of v.25 instead of after  $\text{εως αιωνος}$  of v.26, thus accounting for the plus in cod B in v.25 which is not shared by Ant or by cod A.

The repetitive nature of these verses seems to have made them particularly susceptible to variants. All the major variants, both for 2 Sam and for 1 Chr, except for the addition in v.27 of cod A of 2 Sam, occur just after one or the other occurrences of  $\text{עֲלֵי-רֶגֶל}$ . Cod A contains the plus of MT at v.26, except for  $\text{לֵאמֹר}$ , and then repeats in v.27 a portion of vv.25 f. in a form similar to that of Cod B (cf.  $\text{και νυν}$ ). Cod B for 1 Chr 17:23 f. seems to have suffered a haplography as well, for everything between the two occurrences of  $\text{עֲלֵי-רֶגֶל}$  is missing from that text, but present in mss b e<sub>2</sub>. The texts of Vg, Tg and Syr for 2 Sam follow MT here.<sup>96</sup>

Is it possible, as Smith and Budde suggested, that the text of Chr has influenced that of Sam here? If we consider the form of cod B for both texts, it is striking how the absences dovetail. 1 Chr 17:23 breaks off at  $\text{εως αιωνος}$ , continued in 2 Sam 7:25 by  $\text{Κυrie παντοκρατω ...εως αιωνος}$ , where it breaks off and the text is picked up by Chr, in its v.24, with  $\text{λεγοντων}$ . If Smith and Budde were correct, however, then the text of LXX for Sam should preserve the more original reading here. We have seen, though, that cod B contains an insertion attested nowhere else,  $\text{Κυrie παντοκρατω θεε του Ισραηλ}$  in v.25, as well as a truncated form for v.25b.26 (cf. misreading of  $\text{ηγου}$  as  $\text{ηγου}$  [ $\text{και νυν}$ ] leading to the absence of  $\text{ποιησον}$ ), as well as the abrupt passage in vv.26 f. ...  $\text{εως αιωνος Κυrie παντοκρατω}$ ,

96 Ulrich, QTSJ, does not discuss this passage and thus the text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is not available here.

which can hardly be said to be a better text than that of MT here. If any influence has been exerted here, it seems to have been by 1 Chr on the text of LXX<sup>B</sup> Sam for the translation of הָקַם as πιστωσων, but even that is difficult to prove. Rehm admits that an influence from יֵאָמֵן/πιστωθητω from 1 Chr 17:23 is possible, but no longer verifiable.<sup>97</sup> קוּם in hiphil is never elsewhere translated by a form of πιστουσ, and further, eighteen out of the twenty-three instances of a form of הָקַם with דָּבַר (-אֵם) use ισταναι or one of its compounds.<sup>98</sup> As far as 2 Sam 7:25 is concerned, two possibilities seem to suggest themselves. The first, perhaps less likely but nevertheless feasible, is that ΠICTΩCON represented an erroneous attempt at ENICTHCON,<sup>99</sup> which would preserve the otherwise generalized use of a form of ισταναι.

A second possibility is that indeed the Greek translator was influenced by another passage, although not necessarily the parallel in Chr. At 1 Kgs 8:26, 2 Chr 1:9; 6:17 we find passages remarkably similar to 1 Chr 17:23, all with דָּבַר-אֵם יֵאָמֵן and all translated by πιστωθητω. The uniqueness of הָקַם in MT for 2 Sam 7:25 vis-à-vis πιστουσ in LXX and יֵאָמֵן in all other texts mentioned here attests to its originality. The passages mentioned above, 1 Kgs 8:26 and its parallel at 2 Chr 6:17, as well as 2 Chr 1:9 are all posterior references precisely to the text of 2 Sam 7:25. הָקַם contains the notion of "to found, to establish", eminently logical for the first occurrence of the prayer to Yahweh to found a house/dynasty, as David utters it in 2 Sam 7:25. אָמַן in niphal, on the other hand, meaning "to confirm", is more understandable in the mouth of Solomon as he repeats David's prayer. In Greek, πιστουσ corresponds to יֵאָמֵן but

97 Rehm, p. 9; cf. also Dhorme, p. 332.

98 1 Sam 1:23; 15:13; 1 Kgs 2:4; 6:12 (in A; >B Ant); 8:20 12:15; 2 Kgs 23:3.24; 2 Chr 6:10; 10:15; Dt 9:12; Neh 5:13; 9:8; Dan 9:12; Isa 44:26; Jer 28:6; 29:10; 34:18. The only exceptions are 1 Sam 3:12 (επεγερω); 1 Sam 15:11 (ετηρησεν); 2 Sam 7:25 (πιστωσων); Dt 27:26 (εμμεναι).

99 Cf. Jer 29:10 (LXX 36:10): επιστησω for יִקְרָא.

does not contain the meaning "to found or establish". It may be, therefore, that 1 Chr 17:23 MT was influenced by the subsequent uses of  $\eta\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota$ , while LXX 2 Sam 7:25 was influenced by the other uses of  $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omega\theta\eta\tau\omega$ . In using a different form of this verb, however, it attempted to mark the difference between this occurrence in 2 Sam and the other uses in Kgs-Chr.

Thus, we may consider here that the text of cod B is faulty, having succumbed to a haplography in the Greek, or already in its Vorlage. The various attempts at correction of the text, as witnessed by Ant and cod A, as well as the parallel in 1 Chr, invite us to accept MT as the original form here.

### Conclusions

In this section we have noted a high incidence of genuine textual accidents in the text of LXX which have caused words or entire phrases to fall out of its text where MT has faithfully preserved the original readings. Thus at 1 Sam 4:9; 19:15; 20:34; 25:13; 26:5; 2 Sam 7:23-25 we found pluses in MT whose absence from LXX has been caused by an accident due to homeoteleuton or homeoarcton. In one case only, 1 Sam 19:15, does it seem certain that the accident had taken place in LXX's Vorlage, as it is only in the Hebrew here that the homeoarcton was present. In all the others, the accident could have occurred either in the Greek or in the Hebrew text.

In one case, 2 Sam 6:3 f., the plus in MT is due to a dittography in proto-MT, which caused six words from v.3 to be repeated accidentally, where LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> have preserved the original text.

In three cases, 1 Sam 2:31 f.; 6:4; 23:11 f., LXX or its Vorlage may have deliberately omitted words from the text. We saw above<sup>100</sup> that the LXX indicates a text which was not afraid to eliminate passages which it saw as somehow disturbing to the overall narrative. At 1 Sam 2:31 f., the

---

100 Cf. Part 1.1 on "non-haplogenic" pluses in MT.

text of LXX may have taken advantage of the similarity of two phrases in order to omit the material in between which appeared to allude to Eli's experiencing the fulfillment of the prophecy against his house, which was no longer in keeping with the later application of the text to the priests of Nob and to Abiathar. At 1 Sam 6:4, the mention of the five golden mice appeared to contradict the number of mice in 6:18 and was thus eliminated for the sake of harmony. Finally, at 1 Sam 23:11 f., David's anticipated question was eliminated, again for the sake of coherence and harmony in the text. In each of these places, LXX, or its Vorlage had taken the initiative in eliminating what it found disturbing. In the first two of these, 1 Sam 2:31 f. and 6:4, the excision was made at a point where a word or words were repeated in the text, thus giving the impression that they could have fallen out through an accident due to haplography.

Thus, for these pluses in MT, the text of LXX, in each case but one, shows evidence either of a genuine textual accident or of a deliberate modification of its text. In each case, MT presents us with the more original reading.

## GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

By way of general conclusions from the foregoing study of significant pluses and minuses in the text of Samuel, we may note, first of all, that in the vast majority of cases a large plus or minus occurring in the LXX or 4QSam<sup>a</sup> vis-à-vis MT indicates a further literary activity by LXX or 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

In Part 1.1, we saw that the vast majority of pluses in LXX indicate an expansionist type of activity on the part of LXX or of its Vorlage. In 1.2, MT was shown to be the more original, although longer text, where LXX had frequently shortened its text in order to produce a smoother or more unified narrative. Thus, LXX may not be described as simply "expansionist", but rather it shows a preference for harmony and greater coherence, achieved either by addition to or subtraction from its ancestor text.

In 1.3, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> witnessed to a certain number of expansions in the text, which were found neither in MT nor in LXX and which suggest a typical Palestinian type of text that had produced its own traditions.

The importance of the double translations in 1.4 is not only the presence of insertions in later Greek editions which attempt to bring the text closer to MT, but also the fact that when a divergence exists between the older Greek text and that of MT, even here MT was shown frequently, although not always, to contain the more original text form. In addition, we saw that some of these insertions of a second translation have been made in such a way that, by beginning and ending on the same word, the resultant text appears to have a haplogenic form even though the fact of the second translation proves that the longer, double text is not original.

In Part 2.1, many of the texts which we described as haplogenic in LXX were shown to witness to later insertions into the shorter, more original form of MT. These insertions followed the same general patterns as those examined in 1.1, where the texts were non-haplogenic in form. This phenomenon led to the suggestion that where a text is haplogenic in form, this may indicate a kind of scribal technique which purposely inserted an expansion in such a way that it began and ended with the same word or words. This was not true in all cases, however, for some of the LXX pluses show that MT has truly suffered an accident of homeoteleuton or homeoarcton, although the possibility of this insertion technique suggests that MT has not undergone nearly as many accidents as is generally believed.

On the other hand, 2.2 showed that where MT contains a fuller text in this haplogenic form, the shorter text of LXX is most often attributable to a genuine textual accident, where MT has preserved the longer, even though occasionally more problematic text.

Barthélemy concluded that "les plus de la LXX facilitent généralement le travail de l'exégète concordiste, alors que les 'plus' du MT compliquent d'ordinaire ce travail."<sup>1</sup> The foregoing study seems to have amply borne out this observation.

The text of LXX, and frequently that of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, have been shown to have modified the text in the overwhelming majority of the cases which we have studied here. If our analysis is correct in all, or even in some of the cases we have discussed, this must modify our attitude toward the use of LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> where these large pluses or minuses are concerned. It is undeniable that in the long history of transmission of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament corruptions have crept into the text and that the texts of LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> are helpful for their restoration. Where it is a question of these long pluses and minuses, however, especially those which facilitate the reading of the less carefully

---

1 Barthélemy, "La qualité du Texte....," p. 20.

elaborated text which MT seems often to witness to, perhaps more caution must be used before emending MT too quickly on the basis of another text, and the particular characteristics of MT, LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> must be respected.

Further, if our analysis is correct here, we must modify our approach to those pluses or minuses which appear in a haplogenic form, but which in reality may testify to a later scribal technique of making an insertion into the text.





## B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Albright, W.F. "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible", BASOR 140 (1955) 27-33.
- Allegro, J.M. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan V: Qumrân Cave 4 I(4Q 158-4Q 186). Oxford, 1968.
- Das Alte Testament. Einheitsübersetzung der Heiligen Schrift. Stuttgart, 1974.
- Baentsch, B. Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Göttingen, 1903.
- Barthélemy, D. Les Devanciers d'Aquila. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, X. Leiden, 1963.
- Etudes d'Histoire du Texte de l'Ancien Testament. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 21. Fribourg/Göttingen, 1978.
- "Les problèmes textuels de 2 Sam 11:2-1 Rois 2:11 reconsidérés à la lumière de certaines critiques des 'Devanciers d'Aquila'," 1972 Proceedings: IOSCS and Pseudepigrapha. Ed. R. A. Kraft. Missoula, 1972, pp. 16-88.
- "La qualité du Texte Massorétique de Samuel," The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel. 1980 Proceedings IOSCS. Ed. E. Tov. Jerusalem, 1980, pp. 1-44.
- Barthélemy, D. et al. Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther. Rapport final du comité pour l'analyse textuelle de l'A.T. hébreu institué par l'Alliance Biblique Universelle. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 50/1. Fribourg/Göttingen, 1982.
- Barthélemy, D. et al. Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project. Vol 2: The Historical Books. Stuttgart, 1976.
- Barthélemy, D. and Milik, J. T. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I: Qumrân Cave I. Oxford, 1955.
- Benzinger, I. Die Bücher der Könige. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg i. B., 1899.
- Die Bücher der Chronik. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament. Tübingen/Leipzig, 1901.

- La Bible. Ancien Testament I. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade.  
Traduction et notes par E. Dhorme et al. Paris, 1956.
- La Bible. Traduction française sur les textes originaux par  
E. Osty. Paris, 1973.
- La Bible de Jérusalem. Nouvelle édition entièrement revue  
et augmentée. Paris, 1973.
- Biblia Sacra Juxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem ad Codicum  
Fidem Cura et Studio Monachorum Abbatiae Pontificiae  
Sancti Hieronymi in Urbi. 16 vols. Rome, 1926-1981.
- Birch, B. C. The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth  
and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15. Society of Biblical  
Literature Dissertation Series, 27. Missoula, 1976.
- de Boer, P. A. H. Research into the Text of 1 Samuel I-XVI.  
Amsterdam, 1938.
- "Research into the Text of 1 Samuel XVIII-XXXI,"  
Oudtestamentische Studiën 6 (1949) 1-100.
- Böttcher, F. Neue Exegetisch-kritische Aehrenlese zum Alten  
Testament. Erste Abtheilung: Genesis-2Samuelis.  
Leipzig, 1863.
- Brown, F., Driver, S. R., Briggs, C.A. A Hebrew and English  
Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford, 1907, reprinted  
1968.
- Buber, M. "Die Erzählung von Sauls Königswahl," VT 6  
(1956) 113-173.
- Budde, K. The Books of Samuel. The Sacred Books of the Old  
Testament, Part 8. Leipzig, 1894.
- Die Bücher Samuel. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten  
Testament. Abteilung VIII. Tübingen/Leipzig, 1902.
- "Die Herkunft Sadoqs," ZAW 52 (1934) 42-50.
- Cappel, L. Critica Sacra. Paris, 1650.
- Commentarii et Notae Criticae in Vetus Testamentum.  
Amsterdam, 1689.
- Caspari, W. Die Samuelbücher. Kommentar zum Alten Testament.  
Band VII. Leipzig, 1926.
- Childs, B. S. Exodus. A Commentary. Old Testament Library.  
London, 1974.
- Clericus, J. Veteris Testamenti Libri Historici ex Trans-  
latione Joannis Clerici cum ejusdem Commentario Phil-  
ologico. Amsterdam, 1708.

- Cross, F. M. "The Ammonite Oppression of the Tribes of Gad and Reuben: Missing Verses from 1 Samuel 11 Found in 4QSamuel<sup>a</sup>," The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel. 1980 Proceedings IOSCS. Ed. E. Tov. Jerusalem, 1980, pp. 105-119.
- The Ancient Library at Qumran. 2nd ed. Garden City, 1961.
- "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," HTR 57 (1964) 281-299.
- "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," BASOR 132 (1953) 15-26.
- "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," JBL 74 (1955) 147-172.
- Curtis, E. L., and Madsen, A. A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh, 1910.
- Dhorme, P. Les Livres de Samuel. Etudes Bibliques. Paris, 1910.
- Dillmann, A. Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus. Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament. 2. Auflage. Leipzig, 1880.
- Driver, G. R. "Supposed Aramaisms in the Old Testament," JBL 55 (1936) 101-120.
- Driver, S. R. Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel. 2nd edition, revised and enlarged Oxford, 1913.
- Ehrlich, A. B. Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel. Band 1: Genesis und Exodus. Leipzig, 1908. Band 3: Josua, Richter, I und II Samuel. Leipzig, 1910.
- Elliger, K. and Rudolph, W. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart, 1967-1977.
- Epstein, I. The Babylonian Talmud. 18 vols. London, 1935-1952.
- Erdmann, D. Die Bücher Samuelis. Bielefeld/Leipzig, 1873.
- Ewald, H. Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus. Band II. Göttingen, 1845.
- Fernández Trujols, A. 1 Samuel 1-15 Crítica Textual. Estudios de Crítica Textual y Literaria, Fasc. II. Rome, 1917.

- Field, F. Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta. Oxford, 1875, reprinted Hildesheim, 1964.
- Fischer, B. ed. Novae Concordantiae Bibliorum Sacrorum Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem Critice Editam. 5 vols. Stuttgart/Bad Cannstatt, 1977.
- Geiger, A. Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel. Breslau, 1857.
- Gesenius, W., and Kautzsch, E. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. 2nd English edition, revised in accordance with the 28th German edition (1909) by A. E. Cowley. Oxford, 1910.
- Geyer, J. B. "Mice and Rites in 1 Samuel V-VI," VT 31 (1981) 293-304.
- Gordon, C. H. Ugaritic Manual. II. Texts in Transliteration. Analecta Orientalia 35. Rome, 1955.
- Graetz, H. Emendationes in Plerosque Sacrae Scripturae Veteris Testamenti Libros. Fasc. 3. Breslau, 1894.
- Geschichte der Juden. Erster Band: Geschichte der Israeliten. Leipzig, 1873.
- Gressmann, H. Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels. Die Schriften des Alten Testaments II/1. 2nd ed. Göttingen, 1921.
- Guillaume, A. "L'apport de la langue et des traditions arabes à l'interprétation de l'ancien testament," L'Ancien Testament et L'Orient. Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia I (1957), pp. 111-121.
- Hatch, E., and Redpath, H. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Graz, 1954.
- Heinsch, P. Das Buch Exodus. Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments. Bonn, 1934.
- Hertzberg, H. W. Die Samuelbücher. Das Alte Testament Deutsch 10. Göttingen, 1956.
- I and II Samuel. Trans. J. Bowden. Old Testament Library. London, 1964.
- The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. London, 1966.
- Holzinger, H. Exodus. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament. Tübingen, 1900.

- Houbigant, C. F. Biblia Hebraica cum Notis Criticis. Paris, 1753.
- Notae Criticae in Universos Veteris Testamenti Libros. 2 vols. Frankfurt am Main, 1777.
- de Hummelauer, F. Commentarius in Libros Samuelis seu I et II Regum. Paris, 1886.
- Jastrow, M. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature. 2 vols. New York, 1950.
- Josephus, Jewish Antiquities. Books V-VIII. Trans. H. St. J. Thackeray. Cambridge, Mass., 1950.
- Joüon, P. Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique. Rome, 1923, édition photomécanique corrigée 1965.
- Kamphausen, A. "Philister und Hebräer zur Zeit Davids," ZAW 6 (1886) 43-97.
- Keil, C. F. Die Bücher Samuels. Biblischer Commentar über die Prophetischen Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments. Zweiter Band. Leipzig, 1864.
- Kennedy, J. An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the Old Testament. Edinburgh, 1928.
- Kennicott, B. Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum Variis Lectionibus. 5 vols. Oxford, 1776-1780.
- Kirkpatrick, A. F. The First and Second Books of Samuel. Cambridge, 1930.
- Kittel, R. ed. Biblia Hebraica. 1st ed. Leipzig, 1905; 3rd ed. Stuttgart, 1937.
- Die Bücher der Chronik. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament I,6.1. Göttingen, 1902.
- Klostermann, A. Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige. Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den Heiligen Schriften: Dritte Abteilung. Nördlingen, 1887.
- Koehler, L., and Baumgartner, W. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden, 1953.
- König, F. E. Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1881-1897.
- Kuhl, C. "Die 'Wiederaufnahme' -- ein literarkritisches Prinzip?" ZAW 64(1952) 1-11.
- de Lagarde, P. Anmerkungen zur Griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbia. Leipzig, 1863.

----- . Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canoniconum  
Pars Prior Graece Edita. Göttingen, 1883.

Leimbach, K. A. Die Bücher Samuel. Die Heilige Schrift des  
 Alten Testaments III/1. Bonn, 1936.

Liddel, H. G., and Scott, R. A Greek-English Lexicon.  
 Oxford, 1968.

Lindblom, J. "Lot-Casting in the Old Testament," VT 12  
 (1962) 164-178.

Löhr, M. Die Bücher Samuels von Otto Thenius<sup>3</sup>. Leipzig,  
 1898.

Mandelkern, S. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae  
atque Chaldaicae. 2 vols. Schocken, 1937, reprinted  
 Graz, 1955.

Margolis, M. L. ed. The Book of Joshua in Greek. Part II.  
 Paris, 1931.

McCarter, P. K. I Samuel. A New Translation with Intro-  
duction, Notes and Commentary. The Anchor Bible 8.  
 Garden City, 1980.

Midrash Rabbah. H. Freedman and M. Simon eds. 10 vols.  
 London, 1939.

Myers, J. M. I Chronicles. The Anchor Bible 12. Garden  
 City, 1965.

Neubauer, A. The Book of Tobit. A Chaldee Text from a  
Unique Manuscript in the Bodleian Library. Oxford,  
 1878.

The New American Bible. Nashville/Camden/New York, 1969.

The New English Bible. New York, 1972.

Noort, E. "Eine Weitere Kurzbemerkung zu 1 Samuel XIV,14,"  
 VT 21 (1971) 112-116.

Nowack, W. Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis. Handkommentar  
 zum Alten Testament I/4. Göttingen, 1902.

Nyberg, H. S. Studien zum Hoseabuch. Zugleich ein Beitrag  
 zur Klärung des Problems der alttestamentlichen Text-  
 kritik. Uppsala, 1935.

----- . "Das Textkritische Problem des Alten Testaments am  
 Hoseabuch Demonstriert," ZAW 52 (1934) 241-254.

The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex  
Vaticanus. Vol. I: The Octateuch, Vol II: The Later  
 Historical Books, Vol III, Part I: Esther, Judith,

Tobit. Ed. A. E. Brooke and N. McLean, with H. St. J. Thackeray for Vols. II-III, 1. Cambridge, 1906-1940.

The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version.  
Part II, 2: Judges-Samuel. Ed. The Peshitta Institute,  
Leiden, 1978.

Peters, N. Beiträge zur Text- und Literarkritik sowie zur  
Erklärung der Bücher Samuel. Freiburg i. B., 1899.

Pfeiffer, R. H. "Midrash in the Books of Samuel," *Quantula-  
cumque*. Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake. Ed. R. P. Casey.  
London, 1937, pp. 303-316.

Press, R. "Der Prophet Samuel," ZAW 56 (1938) 177-225.

Rahlfs, A. Septuaginta. 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1935.

Rehm, M. Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen  
der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik. Alttestament-  
liche Abhandlungen XIII/3. Münster i. W., 1937.

Roberts, B. J. The Old Testament Text and Versions. Cardiff,  
1955.

Robertson, E. "The Urim and Tummim, What Were They?" VT  
14 (1964) 67-74.

de Rossi, J. Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti. 4 vols.  
Parma, 1784-1798.

Sabatier, P. Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae seu  
Vetus Latina. 3 vols. Paris, 1751.

La Sainte Bible traduite en français sous la direction de  
l'Ecole Biblique de Jérusalem. Paris, 1948-1953.

Schicklberger, F. Die Ladeerzählungen des Ersten Samuel-  
Buches. Würzburg, 1973.

Schulz, A. Die Bücher Samuel. Erster Halbband: Das Erste  
Buch Samuel. Münster i. W., 1919; Zweiter Halbband:  
Das Zweite Buch Samuel. Münster i. W., 1920.

Schwab, M. ed. Le Talmud de Jérusalem. 11 vols. Paris,  
1871-1889.

Seebass, H. "Zum Text von 1 Sam XIV 23B-25A und II 29, 31-  
33," VT 16 (1966) 74-82.

Sellin, E. Geschichte des Israelitisch-Jüdischen Volkes.  
Leipzig, 1924.

Shenkel, J. D. "A Comparative Study of the Synoptic  
Parallels in I Paraleipomena and I-II Reigns," HTR 62  
(1969) 63-85.



- Simons, J. The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament. Leiden, 1959.
- Smith, H. P. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel. 2nd ed. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh, 1912.
- Smith, R. P. Thesaurus Syriacus. 2 vols. Oxford, 1879.
- Sollamo, R. Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint. Helsinki, 1979.
- Speiser, E. A. "The Nuzi Tablets Solve a Puzzle in the Books of Samuel," BASOR 72 (1938) 15-17.
- Sperber, A. ed. The Bible in Aramaic. Vol. II: The Former Prophets According to Targum Jonathan. Leiden, 1959.
- Stoebe, H. J. Das Erste Buch Samuelis. Kommentar zum Alten Testament VIII/1. Gütersloh, 1973.
- . "Die Goliathperikope und die Form der Septuaginta," VT 6 (1956) 397-413.
- Talmon, S. "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text," Textus 1 (1960) 144-184.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. "The Greek Translations of the Four Books of Kings," JTS 8 (1907) 262-278.
- Thenius, O. Die Bücher Samuels. Kurzgefasste Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament. 1st ed. Leipzig, 1842; 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1864.
- Toeg, A. "A Textual Note on 1 Samuel XIV 41," VT 19 (1969) 493-498.
- Tov, E. "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie," RB 79 (1972) 189-199.
- . "Lucian and Proto-Lucian. Toward a New Solution of the Problem," RB 79 (1972) 101-113.
- . "Midrash-type Exegesis in the LXX of Joshua," RB 85 (1978) 50-61.
- . "The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>," JSOT 14 (1979) 37-53.
- Trebolle, J. "Espías contra consejeros en la revuelta de Absalón (II Sam XV, 34-36). Historia de la recensión como método," RB 86 (1979) 524-543.

- Ulrich, E. C. "4QSam<sup>c</sup>: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14-15 from the Scribe of the Serek Hay-yahad (IQS)," BASOR 235 (1979) 1-25.
- . The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus. Harvard Semitic Monographs 19. Ann Arbor, 1978.
- Vercellone, C. Variae Lectiones Vulgatae Latinae Bibliorum. 2 vols. Rome, 1860 and 1864.
- Walton, B. Biblia Sacra Polyglotta. 6 vols. London, 1655-1657.
- Weingreen, J. "Rabbinic Type Glosses in the Old Testament," JSS 2 (1957) 149-162.
- Wellhausen, J. Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Bücher. 3rd ed. Berlin, 1899.
- . Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels. 6th ed. Berlin, 1905.
- . Der Text der Bücher Samuelis. Göttingen, 1871.
- Wiener, H. M. The Composition of Judges II, 11 to I Kings 11, 46. Leipzig, 1929.
- Woods, F. H. "The Light Thrown by the Septuagint Version on the Books of Samuel," Studia Biblica. Oxford, 1885, pp. 21-38.
- Ziegler, J. et al. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. 12 vols. Gottingen, 1931-1974.
- Zorell, F. Lexicon Hebraicum Veteris Testamenti. Rome, 1940.